Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-066
Thursday
5 April 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-066 *5 April 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Start of Naval Disarmament Process Urged *[PRAVDA 3 Apr]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gremitskikh 4 Apr Briefing on World Issues 3
Yakovlev Meeting With Lithuanians *[TASS]* 3
Geremek on Lithuania *[TASS]* 3
Dumas-Shevardnadze Talks *[TASS]* 3
German 'Victims of Stalinism' *[TASS]* 3
Role of Dashichev *[TASS]* 4
U.S. Congressional Group's Visit *[TASS]* 4
Afghan Rebels, Drugs *[TASS]* 4
UN Resolution on Zionism *[TASS]* 4
Middle East Disarmament *[TASS]* 5
Gorbachev Writes For Socialist Journal *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 5
Foreign Media, Officials Comment on Lithuania *[PRAVDA 3 Apr]* 5
'Studio Nine' Discusses German Unification *[Moscow TV]* 6
WEU Session Discusses European Security Problems 13
German Issue Highlighted *[TASS]* 13
Goerens Views Europe's Future *[PRAVDA 30 Mar]* 13
Zagladin Talks With Delegation *[TASS]* 15
Soviet Interest in Council of Europe Noted *[IZVESTIYA 30 Mar]* 15
Vienna Seminar Views Conversion Issues *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Apr]* 16
Urals Enterprises' Cooperation Suggested *[PRAVDA 5 Apr]* 17
Procurator Interviewed on Barcelona Congress *[Moscow TV]* 17

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Gorbachev To Visit U.S. 30 May-3 June *[TASS]* 18
Further Reportage on Shevardnadze's Visit to U.S. 18
IZVESTIYA on Shevardnadze Remarks *[5 Apr]* 18
Three-Day Talks Outlined *[TASS]* 19
Shevardnadze-Baker Hold Talks *[Moscow Radio]* 19
Baker, Shevardnadze on First Meeting *[TASS]* 20
Shevardnadze, U.S. Senators Meet *[TASS]* 20
U.S. Impressions of Shevardnadze Visit Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 21
Radio Views Issues in Relations With U.S. *[Moscow Radio]* 21
Ukrainian American on Need for Soviet 'Unity' *[TASS]* 22
U.S. Senator To Visit Lithuania Without Visa *[Vilnius International]* 22
Estonia Discusses Satellite Projects With U.S. *[Tallinn Radio]* 23
Bush Cited on Cooperation in Space Research *[PRAVDA 5 Apr]* 23
U.S. Employee Reportedly Met Philippine Rebels *[TASS]* 23

China

Qian on Disarmament; Ties With USSR, U.S. *[IZVESTIYA 1 Apr]* 23
PRC Defense Ministry Official Visits USSR *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Apr]* 24

Frolov Receives New RENMIN RIBAO Head *[PRAVDA 3 Apr]* 24

Northeast Asia

Seoul Plays Host to Soviet Dancers, Businessmen *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 24
South Korea-Romania Diplomatic Ties Established *[Moscow International]* 25
MPRP's Ochirbat Sends Thanks to Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 31 Mar]* 25

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Cambodian Army's Political Chief Interviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Apr]* 25
Commentary Views U.S. Dilemma Over Khun Sa *[Moscow International]* 26

Near East & South Asia

Tutwiler Cited on Iraqi 'Threats' to Israel *[IZVESTIYA 4 Apr]* 27
Iraqi Chemical Weapon Threat 'Inhuman' *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 27
Andreyev Comments on Saddam Husayn's Remarks *[Moscow International]* 28
Husayn Remarks 'Surprising' *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 28
Smuggling, Other Problems on Iran Border Noted *[Moscow Radio]* 29
Andreyev Views Iran's Economy in New Year *[Moscow International]* 30
Niyazov Delegation Visit to PDRY Summarized *[IZVESTIYA 2 Apr]* 30
Lukyanov Pays Visit to Indian Parliament *[TASS]* 31
Further on Visit *[TASS]* 32
Afghan Reconciliation Policy Continues *[PRAVDA 5 Apr]* 32
Afghanistan Peace Front Program Discussed *[Paskov on Moscow International]* 33

Sub-Saharan Africa

Shevardnadze's Tour of African Countries Assessed *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 33

East Europe

Explosion Delays Withdrawing USSR Troop Train *[Prague Radio]* 36
Czechoslovak Parties Prepare for Summer Poll *[IZVESTIYA 3 Apr]* 36
Czechoslovak Official on Status of INF Missiles *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 36
CPCZ Analysis of 1968, Developments Published *[PRAVDA 30 Mar]* 37
Gremitskikh Assails Polish-Lithuanian Communique *[Warsaw PAP]* 37
Polish Newsmen Meet With PRAVDA's Frolov *[PRAVDA 2 Apr]* 38
East Germans Feel 'Deceived' Over Mark Exchange *[PRAVDA 3 Apr]* 38
Hungary's Nonobservance of 'Liberation Day' Noted *[Moscow Radio]* 39
Romanian Delegation's Moscow Activities Reported *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 39
Gorbachev Hails Bulgaria's Mladenov on Presidency *[PRAVDA 4 Apr]* 40

West Europe

Role of West Germans in World War II Profiled *[Moscow TV]* 40
FRG's Bahr Urges Replacement for Opposing Blocs *[TASS]* 40
FRG's Vogel on 'All-European Security Structure' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 31 Mar]* 41
Kohl Hopes 1991 Will Be 'Year of Reunification' *[TASS]* 42
Kohl, Thatcher London News Conference Reported *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Apr]* 42
Thatcher Cited on Soviet Immigrants to Israel *[PRAVDA 3 Apr]* 43
Chernyshev on UK's Cold War Defense 'Signals' *[TASS]* 43
UK 'White Paper' on Defense 'Disappointing' *[PRAVDA 4 Apr]* 44
USSR, UK Foreign Ministry Aides Discuss Asia *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 44
Lithuanian Delegation's Talks in Sweden Reported
[Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET 31 Mar] 45
Lithuanian 'Envoy,' Italian Fascist Link Deplored *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 31 Mar]* 45

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Moscow TV Airs Soviet of Nationalities Session 47
Moscow TV Carries Soviet of Union Session 47
Supreme Soviet Chambers Discuss Economic Bill *[Moscow Radio]* 48
Economic Links Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 49
Economic Relations Bill Passed 4 Apr *[TASS]* 49
Supreme Soviet Discusses Law on Federation *[Moscow Radio]* 49
Commission Chairman Vilkus Resigns *[Moscow Radio]* 50
New Deputy Registered From Academy of Sciences *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 50
Lukyanov Interviewed on Supreme Soviet Work *[PRAVDA 2 Apr]* 50

Political & Social

Yeltsin's Suitability for Elected Office Questioned *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Apr]* 54
Spanish Daily Interviews Vadim Zagladin *[Madrid DIARIO 16, 20 Mar]* 54
Nishanov Chairs Discussion on Meskhetian Turks *[IZVESTIYA 3 Apr]* 56
Lukyanov, Maslennikov Discuss Newspaper Coverage
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 4 Apr] 56
Leningrad's Solovyev Reinstated in CPSU *[TASS]* 57
Presidential Council Series Profiles Aytmatov*[Moscow TV]* *[TASS]* 57
Deputy Minister of Fish Industry Retires *[Kaliningrad Maritime Press Service]* 58
Western Intelligence Seeking to 'Dismember' USSR *[Moscow International]* 59
USSR To Seek Interpol Membership in May *[TASS]* 59
Peasantry Rejects Undermining of CPSU *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Apr]* 59
Commentary on Informal Organizations *[MOSCOW NEWS No 7]* 61
Agrarian Union Congress To Convene 26 April *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Apr]* 63
Supeme Court Plenum Discusses Bribery, Speculation *[TASS]* 63
Charitable Association Formed, Statutes Adopted *[IZVESTIYA 2 Apr]* 64
Reader Backs SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's Views *[1 Apr]* 64

Economic

Conversion of Semipalatinsk Test Site Urged *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Apr]* 65
Il-114 Passenger Aircraft Completes Test Flight *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 67
Chief Designer Interviewed *[PRAVDA 31 Mar]* 67

Military

Article Examines Need for Military Reform *[NEW TIMES No 12]* 68
Justice Ministry Views Military Tribunals' Work *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Apr]* 70
Preparations for WWII Anniversary Discussed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Mar]* 70

REGIONAL AFFIARS

Baltic Republics

Lithuanian Envoy Accepts Referendum Possibility *[TASS]* 72
Vilnius Radio Carries 4 Apr Council Session 72
Agenda Adopted 72
Military Service Debated 73
Gorbachev Reply Examined 73
Lithuanian Supreme Council Greetings to Estonia *[Vilnius Radio]* 74
Supreme Council Statement Accuses USSR *[Vilnius Radio]* 74
Supreme Council Reads Military Service Appeal *[Vilnius Radio]* 74
Lithuanian Council Issues Anti-USSR Statement *[TASS]* 75
Komsomol Official Interviewed on Gorbachev Visit *[Moscow Radio]* 75
More on Komsomol Appeal *[Moscow TV]* 75

Landsbergis Sees Moscow Talks as 'Positive Step' *[Vilnius International]* 76
Representatives Interviewed *[Vilnius Radio]* 76
Landsbergis Urges Telegrams Be Sent to Gorbachev *[Moscow TV]* 77
Further on Lithuanian Supreme Council's Response *[Moscow Radio]* 77
Lithuania Cables Leaders on Military Service *[Vilnius Radio]* 77
USSR Citizens Committees Form in Lithuania *[TRUD 30 Mar]* 77
Committee Tries To Defend 'USSR Citizens' *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 5 Apr]* 78
Citizens' Group Organizes Opposition Rally *[Vilnius International]* 79
More on Rally *[TASS]* 79
Defense Ministry Discusses Anti-Army Campaign *[TASS]* 79
Reportage on Rallies, Pickets Held in Lithuania 80
Pro-Sajudis Rally Demands Negotiations *[Vilnius Radio]* 80
Picket Held at Printing House *[Vilnius Radio]* 80
Lawyers To Picket Procurator's Office *[Vilnius Radio]* 80
Lithuanian Publisher on Possible Sanctions *[Vilnius International]* 81
Deputies Describe 'Difficult' Lithuanian Situation *[Vilnius Radio]* 81
Lithuania Offers Air Time for Political Parties *[Vilnius Radio]* 81
Lithuania Bread Shortage Scare Unfounded *[EKHO LITVY 16 Mar]* 81
20 Mar Landsbergis Supreme Soviet Speech *[EKHO LITVY 22 Mar]* 82
Prunskiene Sends Congratulations to Gorbachev *[EKHO LITVY 16 Mar]* 85
Decree on Lithuanian Commissions Published *[EKHO LITVY 16 Mar]* 85
Landsbergis Sends Open Letters to Officials 85
To Gorbachev *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 14 Mar]* 85
To Ryzhkov *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 14 Mar]* 86
Vilnius Residents Discuss Recent Situation *[TASS]* 86
Public Opinion Center Conducts Poll in Vilnius *[Vilnius International]* 87
Papers Publish Workers' Letters on Lithuania *[TASS]* 88
Lithuanian Deputy on Creating Defense System *[Moscow International]* 89
Cost of Lithuanian Withdrawal From USSR Viewed *[SOYUZ No 8]* 89
Prunskiene Views Economic Ties with Moscow
[Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE 19 Mar] 90
Paper Denies Lithuanian Claim to East Prussia *[PRAVDA 20 Mar]* 91
Lithuanian Local Soviet Election Results Reviewed *[TRUD 30 Mar]* 93
Council Issues Decree on State Borders *[EKHO LITVY 22 Mar]* 93
Council Voids USSR Law on Conscription *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 14 Mar]* 93
Council Declares Restoration of 1938 Constitution *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 14 Mar]* 93
Lithuanian Deputy Chairman Views Independence *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 14 Mar]* 94
Lithuanian Communist Party Appeals for Unity *[EKHO LITVY 16 Mar]* 95
Moscow Public Reacts to Lithuanian Situation *[Moscow TV]* 96
No 'Immediate' Troop Transfers to Lithuania *[Moscow International]* 96
Abalkin Views Baltic-Moscow Ownership Problems *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 20 Feb]* 96
Gorbachev Warns Ryuytel Against Independence *[Tallinn Radio]* 97
New Estonian Prime Minister Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 97
Estonia's Ryuytel on Independence Moves *[Tallinn Radio]* 97
Gorbachev Opposes Estonian Declaration *[AFP]* 98
Estonian Plenum Discusses Party Relations *[TASS]* 99
Military Commissar Protests Labor Service Law *[Moscow Radio]* 99
Tallinn Militia Sets Up Own Trade Union *[IZVESTIYA 9 Mar]* 99
Estonian 20th Communist Party Congress Described *[PRAVDA 31 Mar]* 100
Supreme Soviet Agenda Aimed at Separation *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 30 Mar]* 102
'Unusual' Troop Movements Reported Near Tallinn
[Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE 2 Apr] 103
Latvian Deputy Remarks on 'Lithuania's Example' *[TASS]* 103
Latvian Citizens' Committee Support Lithuania *[Riga International]* 103
Gorbachev Addresses Latvian CP, CPSU Secretaries *[TASS]* 104
Latvian, Union Communists Meet; Gorbachev Speaks *[PRAVDA 5 Apr]* 104
Split in Latvian Communist Party Seen Imminent *[TASS]* 104
Latvian Deputy Shows Support for Lithuania *[Vilnius Radio]* 105
Comparison—'Sajudis' Printing Ban Imposed 105

RSFSR

More on Session of CPSU Russian Bureau *[PRAVDA 4 Apr]* 105
Moscow City Soviet Factions Formed *[TASS]* 106
'Bandit' Group Neutralized in Moscow *[TASS]* 106
More on Vlasov Talk With Union Leader *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 3 Apr]* 106
Moscow Political Institute To Train Cadres *[PRAVDA 30 Mar]* 107
Leningrad Oblast Bureau Reinstates Solovyev *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 4 Apr]* 107
Green 'Party' Registered in Leningrad *[TASS]* 107
Baklanov Meets With Workers in Zelenograd *[Moscow TV]* 108
More on Meeting *[PRAVDA 29 Mar]* 108
First 'Roundtable' Session in Yaroslavl Reported *[IZVESTIYA 29 Mar]* 108
Penalties Increased for Trade Violations *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Mar]* 108
Raykom Secretary Questions Election Defeat *[IZVESTIYA 20 Mar]* 109
New ASSR Supreme Soviet Chairman, Premier *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Apr]* 110
Northern Ethnic Group Privileges Introduced *[TASS]* 110
Komi Working People's Union Formed *[IZVESTIYA 13 Mar]* 111
Sakhalin, Kurile Residents Hold Conference *[TASS]* 111
Small Peoples of North Congress Ends *[Moscow TV]* 111
Benzex Poisoning Suspected After Cistern Leak *[Moscow TV]* 112

Western Republics

Ukrainian Rallies Held for Lithuanian Support *[Vilnius Radio]* 112
Rukh Appeal Backs Lithuanian Independence *[Moscow International]* 112
2d-Round Elections Include Rayon 1st Secretary *[Kiev International]* 112
Ivashko Addresses Ukrainian Gorkom, Raykom Heads *[PRAVDA 31 Mar]* 112
Komsomol Issues Appeal on Youth Demonstration *[TASS]* 112
IAEA Experts To Monitor Chernobyl Effects *[Kiev International]* 113

Caucasus

MVD Spokesman on Armenian-Azerbaijan Situation *[Moscow Radio]* 113
Armenians Reportedly Fire on Azerbaijani Towns *[Baku Radio]* 114
Attacks Reported on Servicemen in Armenia *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Apr]* 114
Yerevan Reports Rail Blockade Continuing *[Yerevan Radio]* 114
Armenian Economic Autonomy Draft Published *[PRAVDA 2 Apr]* 115
Armenia's Arutyunyan Chairs Emergency Council *[Yerevan Radio]* 115
Armenian Movement Leader on Ties With Socialists *[Yerevan Radio]* 116
Georgia's Nuclear Reactor Shut Down *[Moscow TV]* 116
Recent Events in Georgia Examined *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Mar]* 117

Central Asia

Kazakh Komsomol Congress Debates Status *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Apr]* 118
Kazakh CP Chief Nazarbayev Interviewed *[PRAVDA 23 Feb]* 119
Municipal Militia Set Up in Dushanbe *[TASS]* 121
Construction of Canal in Khorezm Oblast Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 122

Start of Naval Disarmament Process Urged

PM0404150990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[K. Sorokin article: "To Seek Points of Contact. On the Way to Military Detente on the Seas"]

[Text] This could be a triumphal year for the cause of disarmament. This is the belief of many political commentators. Why such optimism? The point is that in the upcoming months it is planned to sign a whole series of agreements in this sphere—including treaties on a 50-percent reduction in Soviet and U.S. strategic offensive arms and on the reduction of the NATO and Warsaw Pact armed forces in Europe.

Their significance and influence on the course of world events would undoubtedly be tremendous. But, in order for us to be able to speak of absolute success at the end of the year, it seems to me that international efforts must be made as quickly as possible to seek ways to extend the arms limitation process to the seas.

For many years the United States, Britain, and a number of other NATO countries have shown no interest in the Soviet proposals to begin a political discussion of naval questions. Why? There are many reasons. The chief one is evidently the fact that for many Western leaders military strength is still an effective means of international relations, despite all the changes in the world. And, to their eyes, naval forces appear very attractive as a "power argument." For the countries of the West are ahead of the Soviet Union here. Moreover, the military-technical revolution, which has provided the fleet with hitherto inconceivable possibilities, has lent special significance to this lead.

To be specific, like no other branch of the armed forces, naval forces can be put to effective use in peacetime, too. The most graphic example is "showing the flag" in very remote regions, in crisis spots, close to the territorial waters of the other side. In addition, being spurred on "from one end," the naval arms race could draw countries with no interest in it into an exceptionally costly military competition. (Some Western experts believe that in some respects we overlooked this danger when we began to build aircraft-carrying ships). It is also impossible to escape the impression that the West is now making special use of the "naval factor" to slow the pace of the disarmament talks.

A modern fleet is a very important element of military confrontation. Even if you disregard submarine-launched ballistic missiles [SLBM] and long-range nuclear cruise missiles, which are being discussed at the talks on nuclear and space arms, "general-purpose" naval forces—above all, those of Western countries—today possess considerable potential to influence global and regional correlations of forces. Here it is necessary to mention primarily carrier-based aircraft, which can make nuclear and conventional strikes at a distance of 1,000 km and more (the United States has 14 combat-ready aircraft carriers, while we have none); nonnuclear long-range cruise missiles (the United States has a 12-fold superiority in terms of ships equipped with these); antisubmarine warfare weapons, particularly those aimed at destroying submarines carrying strategic missiles; amphibious warfare facilities and naval infantry earmarked for seizing foreign territory (the United States is 3.5 times ahead in terms of amphibious warfare ships and 16 times ahead in terms of naval infantry), etc.

It is interesting that certain naval armaments used against dry land sometimes prove even more effective than nonamphibious armaments. Let us recall that during the Vietnam war it was the U.S. carrier-based aircraft that bore a tremendous combat load.

It really does turn out that, as the Soviet foreign minister remarked recently, "Today it is from the sea that it is easiest to carry out a surprise attack, a military invasion, or aggression."

These are the real reasons that account for the fact that the United States and other Western countries are in no hurry to sit around a table to negotiate on naval questions.

But there is also a brand of theory designed "for public consumption." One such is to regard the United States as a sea power, but the USSR only as a land power. The conclusion is drawn from this that the United States is more dependent on the sea and, consequently, needs to have a stronger navy. However, you have only to take a cursory look at the map to see that maritime borders make up almost half the total length of the Soviet borders. It is another matter that access to the oceans is geographically difficult for ships and submarines of the USSR Navy. But here, if we follow the U.S. logic with regard to land-based forces, we might as well demand compensation.

Another pretext is the need for the United States to use its superior forces to ensure the security of maritime lines of communication for the transfer of U.S. troops to Europe to help the allies. This pretext is plainly losing its topicality now in the light of the talks being held on evening out military disproportions on the continent and on confidence-building measures. The principle of freedom of navigation—and people in the West also refer to this—will not suffer if all the contracting parties act in a spirit of good will.

It must not be thought, however, that the West is a monolith where everyone is wholeheartedly in favor of continuing the naval competition. "Dissident" voices emerged there long ago, and they are distinctly audible now. Military, politicians, and specialists are pointing out that the continuation of the arms race at sea is unacceptable in the light of the real improvement in the situation in the world. Another important argument is that the existing state of affairs does not accord with the interests of the West itself, because the present situation on the seas is undermining overall stability in the world.

A destabilizing principle consists, above all, in the very existence of U.S. and Western naval superiority. Particularly in the light of the evening out of other imbalances—on dry land, for example. Moreover, the U.S. Navy has a clearly expressed offensive nature. (It is significant that ocean-going ships make up just 12 percent and offshore ships 52 percent of the Soviet Navy, whereas the corresponding figures for the United States are 85 percent and six percent. Nor has the aggressive "Lehman strategy" adopted in the early eighties by the former U.S. Navy secretary been officially repealed.)

The existence of thousands of nuclear charges at sea threatens the rapid flare-up of a nuclear conflict as a result of chance, human error, accident, or malevolence.

It is also known that U.S. naval nuclear systems do not possess "electronic locks" which would rule out their use without the consent of the top U.S. leadership.

It objectively turns out that not only the Soviet Union but also Western countries have an interest in naval talks. No wonder that more and more specialists in the United States itself are not only supporting the idea of talks but are also advancing specific ideas. P. Nitze, former military adviser to President Reagan and an acknowledged expert on military-political problems, has called for the elimination of all sea-based tactical nuclear weapons. And according to THE WASHINGTON POST, W. Crowe, who quite recently left the post of chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, suggested studying the possibility of talks with the USSR on naval tactical nuclear weapons and on reducing naval forces.

Disarmament at sea will hardly be an easy matter to discuss: This sphere itself is a very complex one, many problems have still not been studied, and there are many differences of interests and approaches here. But, as we know, a problem does not become any easier by not being tackled. Moreover, in this case, despite all the extant difficulties, we will not have to start from scratch. During the eighties alone the Soviet Union established much groundwork in the form of specific initiatives with regard to reducing naval forces, confidence-building measures, and curbing dangerous naval activity. Initiatives of both a global and a regional nature. And we are now carrying out a unilateral reduction in our naval forces.

What does the very scheme of possible talks look like now? At the first stage confidence- and openness-building measures which would be relatively easy to implement could largely occupy pride of place. Such as the notification of large-scale exercises, concentrations, and transfers of naval forces, the presence of observers on maneuvers, limiting the scale of exercises, rejecting the expansion of naval activity in crisis regions, withdrawing fleets from regions of combat operations, announcing the presence of nuclear weapons on ships calling at foreign ports, etc. It would also be possible to agree on beginning reductions of tactical nuclear systems.

The second stage could be a question of measures to limit particularly dangerous naval activity and to reduce the threat of a surprise attack from the sea and the ability of naval forces to mount extensive offensive operations at sea and to participate in land operations. For this it would be necessary primarily to reduce forces and means earmarked for strikes against shore targets and for the seizure of territory.

Finally, the question of a profound change in the composition, armaments, and structure of naval forces with a view to limiting them to the need to defend their shores and offshore lines of communication and imparting a nonoffensive nature to them would be resolved at the third stage.

...It was on the seas that mankind's first efforts at arms control were crowned with success. The Rush-Bagot Agreement between the United States and Canada limiting naval forces on the Great Lakes is well known. The Washington conference on naval armaments was held in our present century (1921-1922), and its decisions were developed by a conference in London (1930). The "Montreux Convention" on the Black Sea straits was signed in 1936.

Will the dangerous situation persist much longer whereby it is precisely the "maritime sphere" of arms limitation which threatens to slow the whole disarmament process?

Gremitskikh 4 Apr Briefing on World Issues

Yakovlev Meeting With Lithuanians

LD0404154790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1450 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 April (TASS)—A USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman today evaluated the meeting held by Romualdas Ozolas, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of Lithuania, and other Lithuanian officials with Aleksandr Yakovlev as "a positive event."

Speaking at a briefing here today, Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy chief of the information directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, expressed the opinion that the Lithuanian representatives ought to view the existing problems with regard to the fact that new foundations of the federation, including the right of republics to secede, are being created in the USSR. All this must be formulated in precise and clear laws which are accepted by everybody, he went on, stressing the importance of a businesslike, profound, and substantive dialogue on the essence of the matter, "without any flights of extremism and nationalism."

The Foreign Ministry spokesman described the conversation which took place as useful and expressed the hope that there will also be similar meetings in the future.

Geremek on Lithuania

LD0404133590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1259 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 Apr (TASS)—The Soviet leadership is striving to resolve matters concerning Lithuania by means of dialogue within the framework of the USSR Constitution. In this connection any ill-considered statements or actions from outside can only cause additional complications. This was stated at a briefing here today by Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, commenting on remarks made on 28 March at a meeting held by Bronsilaw Geremek, chairman of the Citizens' Parliamentary Floor Group of the Polish Sejm, with Polish and foreign journalists.

The Foreign Ministry spokesman noted that Bronislaw Geremek, summing up the results of his one-day visit to Vilnius, reported on the adoption of a "Polish-Lithuanian communique," in which, "in essence, an attempt is taken to construct relations with Lithuania as a separate state."

Evaluating such actions by an official representative of Poland as "interference in the internal affairs of the USSR," Yuriy Gremitskikh expressed the view that "this will be noted by the Polish side."

Dumas-Shevardnadze Talks

LD0404143990 Moscow TASS in English 1416 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS—"The March 30 visit to Moscow of French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas and his working meeting with Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze served to continue the active bilateral political dialogue which has become an important element of the system of contemporary inter-European relations," Soviet Foreign Minister spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

Noting that the exchange of views focused on the situation in central Europe, Gremitskikh stressed that "the approaches of both states to German affairs and to the methods of solving them proved to be very close again."

"Both sides expressed satisfaction with the fact that the 'two plus four' mechanism was put into action," he said. "The first 'six nation' meeting showed that it could be an efficient instrument for settling external aspects of Germany's unification.

"The Soviet Union and France," Gremitskikh continued, "adhere to very close stands. They believe it necessary to synchronise progress towards German unity with the all-European process, including the achievement of agreements at the Vienna talks and other steps to promote East-West rapprochement on the continent. The all-European summit meeting scheduled for 1990 will be an important milestone on this road," he said. Gremitskikh stressed that during the ministerial meeting "the sides expressed their common view on the need to start practical preparations for the meeting without any delay."

Noting that "the situation in Lithuania was reviewed" during the meeting, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said that "Roland Dumas understood the complexity and delicacy of the problem."

German 'Victims of Stalinism'

LD0404171390 Moscow TASS in English 1609 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh commented today on publications in the East German press that lots of innocent Germans were kept in camps for interned persons in the Soviet zone of occupation during postwar years and that a number of graves have been found.

During the war, the three allied countries of the anti-Hitler coalition agreed to punish Nazi criminals for atrocities against other peoples, Gremitskikh said. In addition to war criminals, a number of activists of the Nazi party, militarists and Nazi collaborators were also brought to criminal responsibility.

There were camps for interned persons not only in the Soviet occupation zone but in others as well. People who were not guilty of specific crimes but were considered

"dangerous for allied aims", according to directive No. 38 of the Allied Inspection Council in Germany, including many former members of various Nazi paramilitary units and combat detachments, were also kept there.

Amid the economic dislocation and hunger in the wake of the war unleashed by Hitlerite Germany, it was not easy to provide normal conditions for these people in the camps, Gremitskikh said. Death of starvation and exhaustion was not rare among the civilian population of Germany, POWs and interned persons, although the Soviet Union supplied the local population with as much food as possible. Such deaths were characteristic not only of the Soviet zone but of the Western zones as well.

"All these victims are victims of war, a war unleashed by German fascism and militarism," Gremitskikh said.

Speaking about the graves of "victims of Stalinism on German soil", as some newspapers described them, he said that a search is under way for documents which could make the circumstances of the deaths clear.

Role of Dashichev

LD0404171890 Moscow TASS in English 1629 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS—"Professor Dashichev and his political allies are not members of the expert community participating in working out Soviet policies," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

He was commenting on publications in the foreign press which cite this specialist from the Economy and World Socialist System Institute and some other Soviet scholars alleging that the Soviet Union may agree to the united Germany's membership in NATO. These scientists allege that the Soviet Union's recent statements do not reflect its final stance but are the usual moves before serious talks.

A question asked of Gremitskikh also pointed out that Vyacheslav Dashichev himself and some of his colleagues pose as advisers to the top Soviet politicians, or do not object when so designated by foreign journalists.

The Soviet spokesman rejected the idea of Dashichev's and his colleagues' involvement in the working out of Soviet policies and said "they were engaging in speculations on their own behalf."

U.S. Congressional Group's Visit

LD0404171990 Moscow TASS in English 1639 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS—A U.S. congressional delegation led by Democratic leader in the Senate George Mitchell is to visit the Soviet Union at the invitation of its parliament between April 9-14, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

The senators will meet Soviet parliamentarians to discuss Soviet-U.S. and international relations. They will be informed of the progress of perestroyka and political and economic reforms in the Soviet Union.

The delegation will meet Soviet leaders, including the chairman of the Supreme Soviet and members of the Presidential Council, Gremitskikh said.

According to Gremitskikh, the Soviet Union considers this visit as part of Soviet-U.S. political dialogue aimed at deepening the two countries' mutual understanding and cooperation .

Afghan Rebels, Drugs

LD0404172690 Moscow TASS in English 1710 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS—There are grounds for U.S. suspicions of Afghan rebels' involvement in drug trafficking in South Asia, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

He commented on the statement by U.S. Secretary of State's aide Melvin Levitsky in Islamabad that the United States warned Afghan rebels, receiving assistance from the U.S. Administration, of inadmissibility of drug production and sale.

At least 800 tonnes of opium are produced annually in the area controlled by Afghan rebels, Gremitskikh said. About 200 underground factories in Pakistan produce drugs from raw materials supplied by Afghan rebels. The drugs are sold all over the world.

Drug syndicates have considerable material opportunities and are a great force. They are well armed due to U.S. supplies.

Gremitskikh said that a deadlock is thus formed and a way out of its could be found only through cessation of arms supplies to Afghan opposition forces and promotion of measures leading to Afghan settlement, political and economic stability.

UN Resolution on Zionism

LD0404175190 Moscow TASS in English 1732 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS—The discussion of UN General Assembly's Resolution No. 3379 which identifies Zionism with racism could have undesirable consequences, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

The resolution was adopted in specific historic conditions, Gremitskikh said. There was no such a case in UN history when adopted resolutions were cancelled.

"A situation could emerge when the world community will be drawn into the process of 'rewriting' the UN

history," Gremitskikh said. "This could divert the organization's attention from resolving acute international problems and will complicate businesslike cooperation in the United Nations, where a favourable climate is being established."

The Soviet point of view is that it is preferable to concentrate on practical measures aimed at Middle East settlement, Gremitskikh said.

Middle East Disarmament

LD0404181490 Moscow TASS in English 1759 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS—It is expedient to start the process of disarmament in the Middle East, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

Alarming information from the region shows that arms race continues in the region. It can spread to all possible spheres, including missiles, antimissile, nuclear and chemical weapons. The region is oversaturated with weapons, only NATO and the Warsaw Treaty have more, Gremitskikh said.

Gremitskikh recalled the Soviet position in favour of missile, nuclear and chemical disarmament and said this position makes no geographic exceptions.

Gremitskikh spoke about the February initiative by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze to make the Middle East a zone free of nuclear and chemical weapons.

"The Soviet proposals are valid and the time itself stresses the necessity to start resolving the problem, including, of course, the settlement of the Arab-Israeli confict," Gremitskikh said.

Gorbachev Writes For Socialist Journal

PM0504091990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "The World of the Future and Socialism"]

[Text] The presentation of the new international edition of "Socialism of the Future (Tribune of Political Debates)," which is coming out in spring 1990 in various languages, has been held in Madrid. The leadership of this periodical believes that it can "fulfill the role of an international discussion forum" of representatives of various directions of socialist thought, by expounding the views of eminent activists in the world workers movement who represent its various trends. The first edition contains articles by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Willy Brandt, chairman of the Socialist International, and a number of other authors from East and West European countries.

The leadership committee includes Alfonso Guerra, deputy general secretary of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party; Oskar Lafontaine, one of the leading activists of the SPD [Social Democratic Party]; Michel Rocard, the French prime minister; Giorgio Napolitano (Italian Communist Party); Claudio Martelli (Italian Socialist Party); Adam Schaff; and others.

The leadership of the publication made a proposal to the USSR Academy of Sciences International Workers' Movement Institute that its materials be published in the USSR, and that Soviet representatives participate in its editorial board. The institute and its periodical "The Working Class and the Contemporary World" are starting to publish these materials. The second volume of the periodical, which will come out in April, will contain the articles by M.S. Gorbachev and Willy Brandt. The broad exchange of opinions on problems in the new international edition is provoking interest among everyone who wants to be involved in the process of the development of socialist theory and practice, and discussions on the criteria and paths of social progress on the threshold of the 21st century.

Foreign Media, Officials Comment on Lithuania

PM0404144590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA-TASS roundup: "Within the Framework of Soviet Laws"]

[Text] 2 Apr—The USSR president's appeals to the Lithuanian people and to the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet are being analyzed in detail by the foreign mass media. The United States' CBS Television has drawn attention to "the utmost seriousness of M. Gorbachev's warning." Many press organs have called on the Lithuanian leadership to take a responsible attitude to observing USSR laws.

London: "If the republic's leadership, headed by V. Landsbergis, refuses to compromise on its unilateral proclamation of independence, everything achieved in East-West relations will be placed in jeopardy. Lithuania is an integral part of the Soviet Union, and the question of satisfying its demands should be discussed carefully and without haste," an editorial in the SUNDAY CORRESPONDENT said. "Circumstances require the Lithuanian Government to show patience. But, instead of this, by hastily proclaiming independence and proclaiming disobedience in response to Moscow's well thought-out stand, the Lithuanian leadership is ignoring the broader consequences of its actions."

Just as we have supported Gorbachev in easier times, the newspaper stressed, we must lend him our support now, at this difficult time, and make it clear to the Lithuanian leadership that this is our position. If the Lithuanian leaders want to achieve their objectives instantly, at a stroke, they must realize that they will be on their own.

Helsinki: An interview which Finnish Prime Minister Harri Holkeri gave to Finnish radio last Sunday has been published here.

Lithuanian President V. Landsbergis recently said that Finland has no independent foreign policy, he said. Landsbergis made a similar assessment of Sweden's foreign policy. This, H. Holkeri pointed out, shows that Landsbergis is not familiar with Finland's foreign policy, and it also demonstrates the "republic leadership's impatience and political ineptitude."

The Finnish prime minister expressed amazement at more and more new demands to speak out on the situation in Lithuania, despite the fact that the situation there has essentially remained unchanged in recent days. Comical accusations of being too slow to react to the situation in Lithuania are sometimes leveled at Finland. H. Holkeri recommended that the political leaders of Lithuania and the other Baltic republics show moderation.

Rome: The question of Lithuania must be resolved within the framework of the laws which exist in the USSR. Italian Foreign Minister G. de Michelis said this in an interview with the newspaper IL TEMPO. "We must openly say to our Lithuanian friends," he said, "that they cannot avoid talks and observance of the established procedures. The main cause of the mutual lack of understanding hampering the start of dialogue should be sought not so much in Moscow as in Vilnius."

The head of the Italian Foreign Ministry particularly stressed that the processes now taking place in the Baltic affect the question of borders in Europe deemed inviolable. "It should not be forgotten that in Helsinki the European states ratified the borders established in 1945," he said. "I believe we should recognize the Soviet Union's right to draw up clear, precise procedures that will apply to all."

The minister dwelt in particular on the problem of Lithuanians who have deserted from the Soviet Army. "What Western state would agree to the right to desert in its own country?" he asked.

P. Rauti, leader of the neo-fascist Italian Social Movement - National Right Party, has sent "a message expressing solidarity" to V. Landsbergis. Rauti, who was mixed up in more than one criminal act by Italian neo-fascists in the past, expressed his willingness to send a delegation from his party to the Lithuanian parliament "when material circumstances permit."

Ottawa: Many Canadian political scientists and economists cannot imagine how Lithuania could survive economically in the modern world if it were completely independent. According to THE OTTAWA CITIZEN, "as far as any of the Baltic republics are concerned, the search for political solutions connected with leaving the Soviet Union is child's play in comparison to the task of severing the economic ties which link them to the Soviet Union. Aware of the centralized nature of the Soviet economy, experts simply cannot see how the Baltic states can secede without severing the arteries of their economic activity."

'Studio Nine' Discusses German Unification

LD0404170690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 3 Apr 90

["Studio Nine" program presented by Valentin Zorin with Klaus Blech, FRG ambassador to the USSR, Sir Rodric Braithwaite, UK ambassador to the USSR, and Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, head of the CPSU Central Committee International Department; Blech and Braithwaite speak in German and English, respectively, with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades.

The letters you have sent to the "Studio Nine" address can be regarded as a kind of barometer of public interest. The permanent audience of our broadcast, which is made up of people who are interested in international affairs and who possess a fairly large range of information, reacts precisely to what at present is the main thing and worries our audience most of all. I must note that of late the predominant number of letters which we have been receiving is connected with the question of the process of the unification of Germany. This is being asked and written about most of all so that I think that we'll be doing the right thing if, taking into account the wishes of our audience, we devote our conversation today to precisely this problem. And to offer you the opportunity to look at it, so to speak, from different angles we have invited to take part in our conversation today such qualified people as Mr. Klaus Bech, the FRG ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Soviet Union; Sir Rodric Braithwaite, the UK ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to our country; and Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, head of the CPSU Central Committee International Department and doctor of history. By the way, Valentin Mikhaylovich was the ambassador of the Soviet Union to the FRG for several years.

Before we start our discussion I want to offer for your attention a series of mini-interviews on the problem of interest to us which our correspondent Sergey Goryachev recorded on the streets of Moscow. In the previous Studio Nine broadcast we also resorted to this method. But it seems to me that the acuteness of the subject and Soviet people's interest in it justify the fact that we are making use of it today. I ask for the tape to be switched on.

[Begin recording] [Goryachev] That a united Germany will appear on the map of Europe is probably no longer doubted by anyone. When and in what conditions will this happen? This question is now at the center of politicians' attention—but hardly of politicians' only. What is the ordinary people's attitude to the prospects for the unification of Germany? Let's ask passers-by on Moscow's streets this question.

[Elderly lady] I took part in the war and I know that—it seems to me that after the unification of Germany, in the

ensuing period—I am afraid that our border will gradually be revised, nevertheless.

[Elderly man] My position is as follows: It is a very good an helpful thing for us to have a united German state in Europe. But the task is to ensure that this state should never threaten the European peoples with its aggression. That is my position. Among other things, during the years of the past war I was in concentration camps on the territory of fascist Germany. I've had a very hard life and now my fear is that this reunited Germany should not again turn out, well, to be a base from which aggression would start—that is what I am afraid of.

[Young girl] It seems to me that it is right that they are reuniting because it is strange that two peoples—one and the same people—has two states. It seems to be that they should reunite.

[Second elderly man] This is what I believe: Of course a nation is a nation. The German nation is a common one—there is no German GDR nation and there is no German FRG nation. It is a common one. Well then, sooner or later, evidently, the question of unification would arise. But I believe at the same time that, well then, when uniting, the further destiny, now already of the entire Germany, must be decided.

So, the FRG must leave the NATO bloc, and if the further destiny is to be preordained, Germany as a whole must remain as a Germany, well, which, let's say, is neutral and which is not a member of any bloc, of any associations.

[Middle-aged man] My view here is unequivocal. Germany should unite. And Gorbachev's position here is correct. It is impossible to hold in check popular uprisings, so to speak, and the unification of a people.

[Third elderly man] My attitude to this is a guarded one because the Germans have attacked neighboring countries many times, in particular Russia. And for this reason it is probably necessary to restrict them by some means when they unite because on the whole, we are the victorious country. And it is not only we who are interested in this but also our neighbors.

[Second middle-aged man] And I think that this will not undermine our security. The unification of Germany is a natural process. It is to go through and, on the whole, the sooner they unite, the calmer it will be in Europe: that is what I think.

[Third middle-aged man] This is a very complicated, a very complicated matter. This is what I believe: Will this unification not again provide a spur to war? Because this matter is a most complicated one. If Germany unites, reactionary forces can again arise. And again, for this reason the status—the one which was concluded previously between the four powers—it should remain intact and control these forces and so that these things do not emerge—I am speaking of reactionary forces. [end recording]

[Zorin] You see, the views which we have heard differ, on the whole. But at the same time we have heard that many Soviet people are experiencing quite definite misgivings in connection with the process of the emergence in the center of Europe of a united German state.

I want to start our discussion by asking you, Ambassador Blech, this question: What is your attitude to such anxiety of Soviet people and do you regard such anxiety as being well-founded?

[Blech] Before answering your question I would like to say that what these people said has made a great impression on me, proceeding from two aspects which were singled out. Above all, they have stated perfectly clearly that the Germans are one nation. They are entitled, just as all others, to live in a single state. All said in different ways that the division is not a natural condition. Then anxiety was expressed, which we, of course, can understand. We cannot expect people, especially elderly people, to forget so simply and easily what they went through during World War II. This tragedy affected them personally, virtually everyone: losses of relatives, of territory, the losses inflicted on the country and the terrible suffering. We know that this is still alive in memories now, and causes worry, a feeling of anxiety and uncertainty. There are grounds for this, and we understand it. One of the people speaking on the street said that the sooner the unification happens, the better, the calmer Europe will become. I think he hit the nail on the head, the decisive aspect. The division of Germany, until very recently, has been the most obvious determinant of the division of Europe. Once Germany is unified, the division of Europe will finally disappear, and this will take place at a crucial moment. For us, and I think for many Europeans, unification represents the elimination of hindrances on the joint road to a greater Europe. I think that the person on the street understood it correctly, he expressed justified expectations, which are also shared by others, that we Germans will go along this road in a completely responsible way. Yes, we will do that.

[Zorin] Thank you. Sir Rodric, what do you think, do Soviet people have grounds for apprehension about the unification of Germany?

[Braithwaite] I was struck by how people in the street answered the question. I noted that all, with exception perhaps of one person, who replied that he took a neutral position, said that Germany should unify, that the two parts of it should be together again. I also agree that the division of Germany, the division of people was an abnormal phenomenon and a destabilizing factor. From my point of view this abnormal and destabilizing situation in the middle of Europe should be changed to everybody's advantage. I also understand the disquiet of people who want the unification of Germany to be accompanied by guarantees that there will be no repetition of the tragic events of the past. Of course, such sentiments are very strong in my country too, that is natural. Of course, I cannot speak on behalf of the

German people about such sentiments being as strong in Germany as they are in the USSR. The question is one of how to achieve the aims that we want to achieve and which stand before us.

[Zorin] Valentin Mikhaylovich, I should like you to briefly answer this question both as historian and as politician.

[Falin] This problem has various projections, many aspects and facets. If we in the USSR sincerely adhere to the idea of collective security in Europe, if we understand the project of a common European home as a specific practical task of policy, then naturally it would be difficult for us oppose the unification of Germany, that is, to oppose one nation deciding for itself what the state form of its future existence should be. I can remind you that back in 1945 at the end of the war and immediately after the war the USSR was the country which advocated that Germany, conquered and laid low, should be regarded as a single whole state. It was the USSR that put forward the proposal at Potsdam that the four conquerors should treat this state as a single entity. However, in this problem there is also the aspect to which attention has been drawn in the answers to the questions on the Moscow streets, namely, what will the military status of this Germany be? What will the territory of this Germany be in a military respect? This is not an abstraction to us. Our experience of relations with Germany is divided both into the positive, very positive even, age-old positive, and the extremely negative because the biggest catastrophe, the biggest tragedy in our history, came from German soil.

I would like briefly to end with the words of Margaret Thatcher, who in London on 18 March said the following: Not one of us in East or West Europe—including the USSR—should feel less secure as a result of the unification of Germany.

I think that is a very accurately-expressed idea. It is a very accurately-expressed sense not only of the British attitude to this problem but also of the Soviet attitude.

[Zorin] I should draw attention to the fact that the British prime minister was quoted not by the UK ambassador but by Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin. Valentin Mikhaylovich, I should like to ask you to continue the conversation and answer this question. In letters which have been received addressed to "Studio Nine" there are what I would call acutely critical letters in which the question is asked as to whether the process of German unification now taking place is not the result of some kinds of mistakes including mistakes in foreign policy? Is it really the result of mistakes or is this process historically inevitable and conditioned?

[Falin] I would put it this way, that the division of Germany was the result of major political mistakes, of an incorrect assessment of the perspectives, short-term, middle-term and especially long-term, but that mistake was committed primarily by the Western powers. The main reason for the division was the withdrawal from the joint policy on the basis of the decision of the anti-Hitler coalition, the transition to the cold war. Therefore the question of why what happened and what followed is not theoretical today. Today we must dissociate ourselves not only from the division of Germany. We must today dissociate ourselves from the policy which led to the division and conditioned the fact that the division was a fact in Europe for 45 years with all its consequences. What was always decisive for us was the question of security and we relegated questions of social and economic organization to the competence of the German people itself. Therefore, to answer your pointed question as to whether the division was not a mistake and whether overcoming the division is not a mistake, I would answer as follows: That hitherto we in Europe after the war have lived by temporary concepts, one provisional solution, and want to replace this by another provisional solution. Eventually when we have all acknowledged that there should not be war in Europe, there should not be war at all, we must concern ourselves with permanent solutions, with solutions which will give each of us confidence in stability today, tomorrow and the day after tomorrow, when each of our peoples can fully concentrate both its thoughts and resources on constructive, peaceful deeds. In this sense we are being given a special chance today.

[Zorin] That sounds convincing but I must say that to judge again from the letters which we have been receiving, many Soviet people are somewhat alarmed by the form in which this process of unification is taking place and in particular by certain actions, excuse me Mr. Ambassador, by Bonn. One's attention is drawn to certain economic actions. People are saying, is it not a question of the GDR being sold off? One's attention is drawn by the active, I should say too active participation of FRG politicians in the election campaign in the GDR. This is causing certain alarm among Soviet people. I can see Sir Rodric wants to say something about this.

[Braithwaite] I see what you are driving at; but before talking on this question, I would like to comment on your historical analysis. I just want to comment on the historical analysis you have made. As you know at the present time many historians are trying to explain whether certain specific people can be blamed for the division of Germany. Undoubtedly in the eyes of many people, including many British historians, Stalin bears a proportion of responsibility for the cold war and the division of Germany. However, I think this question can be left to the historians. The question which you ask concerns not history but current policy, as to whether the policy leading to the unification of Germany is erroneous or not. As I understand it it is a question not only of the policy of the Western states but also the policy of the present Soviet Government.

In my view, and I should like to stress this, Soviet Government policy has contributed very considerably to the process of the rapid unification of Germany and for the reasons which we have mentioned earlier—that the

division of Germany is a factor of instability—in my view this is a correct policy.

[Zorin] Over to you, Mr. Blech.

[Blech] Indeed, if you look at what has happened in the past half year or year, no one could have foreseen, no one would have thought that Bonn would all at once decide to direct the events and would start to pursue the relevant policy—rather the opposite. Let us recall what happened. Several years ago in the Soviet Union new thinking in politics was initiated. But the then government of the GDR was very late in joining this new thinking—if it could be said at all that it did join this new thinking. As a result of this we witnessed last summer the mass exodus of citizens of the GDR. Then came the famous 9 November when the Berlin Wall fell, a wall which was the most shameful demonstration of that division, a demonstration of how not to treat one's own citizens. All this had previously been seen in this light by the Soviet side too. When the Wall fell, there started a spontaneous movement of the people, and now the time has come to solve the economic problems. The inhabitants of the GDR are our countrymen. When the unification of the two German states takes place all these details will be settled. The new GDR Government bears responsibility for this. That is its task. But what it needs is economic aid. And this aid will be given to it by its countrymen in the FRG. And no political demands are tied to this economic aid. Only the kind of aid which can bring great benefit will be given, and aid can only bring benefit if the state system—which by all accounts is bankrupt—is changed, reformed. And how that is done is the GDR's affair. The fact that the political forces of the GDR maintain close contact with the political forces, the democratic forces, of the FRG, is the most normal and natural thing, is it not? Not one politician from Bonn has imposed his own participation in events in the GDR, they have been going there by invitation from the GDR.

[Falin] I think the situation as Mr. Blech has sketched it for us seems a bit too rosy, it is too like a fairy tale to resemble the truth. Life is more complicated. One has often gained the impression and not just the impression that the representatives of the authorities not to mention unofficial persons from the FRG have behaved on the territory of the GDR not like guests but like hosts. So you and I will not try to create the impression that everything here is in order and that the question has never arisen of whether the creation of a new legal community, a pan-German one, is beginning, in violation of the existing law, and whether this is the best road to law being respected.

The second thing that I consider it necessary to note is that we today hear and see various models of German unification being discussed and there is a basic difference between these models. In some cases there is talk of the creation, on the basis of the two existing states, of a new single German state with a new Constitution, of a state embodying all that is best in the one part of the present Germany and in the other. But there are also plans which envisage not unification but Anschluss, the bigger state swallowing the lesser one, the stronger state swallowing the less strong one, that is, the solution of the said German question essentially from a position of force. This question is for us also important and it is not at all as inoffensive as it seems. You and we need to clearly have before us a perspective. What do we want? Do we want a change of the facts in such a way that all sides including the four powers may finally feel satisfaction, or do we want to prove that someone was more right in his past vision, in his past approaches, than someone else? Let us put away our old disputes. Let us act as Paine, the American philosopher of the 18th Century said, as if we were the first sensible people on this earth.

[Zorin] I should like to address my next question to you, Ambassador Blech. The predominant idea in the West now is of a united Germany joining NATO. If one looks at the logic of this it implies the unification of Germany while preserving the military division of Europe. Is this possible?

[Blech] Before answering your question, with your permission I would like to add to what Mr. Falin has just said. Of course, questions arise as to what we want, how we want to implement everything, how we organize what is without doubt the very complex process starting now and enduring with the day of the reunification of Germany, as to how natural the unification is, as to how beneficial it will be for Europe, also as to how complex the road to it is, because this constitutes a transition from one complicated situation to another. We accept all these difficulties, we will have to overcome them. Here there still exist various opinions and often they are contradictory ones. It is clear that all this will still have to be discussed. It will be a process which will affect initially primarily the two German states which are coming closer to one another. And there is the fact that the GDR needs economic support which we want to grant it. The GDR must become competitive on the world market and the GDR citizens must achieve the same standard of living—not immediately of course, that is simply impossible—as their countrymen in the FRG. They must live in a social state that the FRG comprises.

All these problems have to be solved over a certain length of time. It is impossible to solve it all at once. In my opinion, there is no danger at the present moment of an Anschluss overnight.

What does the external aspect of this problem look like? How can relations with our neighbors be regulated? Of course, when people say that the question of the unification of Germany affects all Europeans, we share that point of view. I should like to say that German history has always been linked to the development of relations with our neighbors. To see this, it is enough to take a look at the map.

Now for the issue of membership in NATO—the Atlantic alliance. The Atlantic alliance is today a very decisive factor in stability and security in the whole of Europe. The FRG's membership in that alliance is one of the determining factors of this state of security. We are now planning the unification of Germany. What could be the alternative to continued NATO membership? Let us say, neutrality. The very concept of neutrality in no way fits in with today's system of thinking, since neutrality envisages a state of confrontation, where the party which adopts and occupies a position of neutrality, as it were, departs from a dispute and is subjected to pressure from the two parties to the dispute. The decisive thing will be to change the function of the military-political alliances toward politicizing their activity, including lessening the military structures of East and West, attaining partnership in the security sphere between the two alliances on the European continent, and creating a single security system in Europe. On this plane, we envisage the following role which Germany could play. For example, we must take resolute further steps in the field of disarmament. Therefore, we, with our partners, are stressing the need for an agreement on conventional arms and confidence-building measures to be signed in Vienna at the end of this year, in order then to move on without a break to the next stage of these negotiations on conventional arms, and not only those. We can also imagine—this often comes up—that, in the event of a crisis arising on the European continent, a mechanism combining the positions of both military-political systems could be elaborated under the roof of the Helsinki conference by its 35 participants. This is not the first time that we have expressed these thoughts, and I believe that the discussions will continue.

[Zorin] Well, when we talk about a mechanism, we need to think here, of course, and evidently work will proceed, but you obviously understand that Soviet people are greatly agitated by the problem of guarantees for their security. Also, perhaps, when we deal with a mechanism and guarantees, we have to operate on the basis that these guarantees ought to be contained in a peace treaty, don't you think so, Mr. Blech? A peace treaty has still not been signed, despite the passage of 45 years.

[Blech] You say that there is no peace treaty, although 45 years have passed since the moment the war ended. Today we say, in this regard, that it is because 45 years have passed. Peace treaties are concluded when, say, a year has passed since the end of a war, and then relations between the victors and the vanquished are determined, and after that there is an attempt to establish normal relations on a new basis. That did not happen in 1945. Things developed along a different path. Only now are people starting to talk about a peace treaty, but the present structures have already, as it were, overtaken the need to conclude a peace treaty. We have the agreements within the framework of the Helsinki Act, in which 35 states, including the United States and Canada, participated—although that is not a treaty from a technical point of view.

Permit me to make a slight philosophical digression. We are talking all the time about a peace treaty with Germany and that treaty is allegedly supposed to regulate the consequences of the war for Germany. Of course, this is very important for us. But to time a peace settlement with Germany to coincide with the conclusion of the cold war is not, strictly speaking, our problem. However, since it is closely interwoven with the German aspect, we have to deal attentively with that very issue. Here one circumstance is conditional upon the other.

[Zorin] Mr. Ambassador, you are not a great, enthusiastic supporter of a peace treaty. I am interested in hearing what Sir Rodric thinks about this.

[Braithwaite] Forgive me if I touch on another few matters which you dealt with earlier. I think that they have a direct bearing on what we are discussing now. Mr. Falin implied that what happened in the GDR on 18 March did not, in some sense, count fully. He also quoted the prime minister of Great Britain, and if I did not agree with that, I would probably have already been removed from my post. I hope that I am right in agreeing now with the words spoken by Lenin in 1917, that the Russian soldiers voted with their feet. I feel that is a very apt expression describing their attitude to that issue. I think that the same thing happened in the GDR, when many of its inhabitants also voted with their feet by leaving the country. On 18 March, during the elections in the GDR, the results, which we saw and which surprised all of us, were, in exactly the same way, a very good expression of what people thought. The Christian Democrats should now have the opportunity to set up a coalition government with the Communist Party [as heard], which lost a lot of votes but gained something. I feel that the results of those elections in Germany have now created a really democratic situation. I also believe that it is important to note that nobody should think that the political situation in the GDR can to some degree be called undemocratic or described as not corresponding to democratic laws.

I should like to dwell on what the question of the future Germany's membership in NATO might yield. In her speech, Mrs. Thatcher noted the importance, not only of what NATO members think of the unification of Germany, but also of the thoughts of other countries, such as the Soviet Union, for example. It is very important to remember where Germany is situated. Germany's membership in NATO, from the point of view of the Poles, for example—and the marshal of the Sejm expressed his opinion about that here—stability in the center of Europe must be maintained. [sentence as heard] Of course, it is correct that it is important for each European and, as Mrs. Thatcher noted, any person living beyond Europe's borders for there to be a stable, constructive Europe and for constructive relations to be built with each other.

I agree with Mr. Blech that a peace treaty is a rather obsolete trend, not only because 45 years have already passed and it is too late to talk about signing a treaty, but

also because perfectly normal relations already exist between Germany and other states.

If we recall that it is necessary to sign the treaty with 54 states, as well as with Namibia and Uruguay, for instance, it may turn out to be a nighmare. The formula for tackling this question which has been put forward, the two plus four formula which presupposes that the four countries which were victors in the Second World War with Germany will be taking part makes it possible for us to avoid precisely what we have been talking about. A broader context for tackling this question is what is needed.

[Zorin] I hope that our outstanding guests will not take offense if I say that today they showed a degree of nihilism with regard to international law. I understand that 45 years is 45 years. I have to recall that I am a historian and that I could give you a large list of peace treaties concluded significantly later than 45 years after the end of war and a pragmatic approach is a uselful approach and it is sensible to proceed from what exists today, but there exists international law which demands—pardon me here, but it demands this tiny detail—the end of the war with the aid of a legal document. Maybe I am mistaken.

[Falin] I think that in this context even a special case exists, definitely so. The absence of a unified Germany, the existence of two German states used to be a pretext earlier not to have a peace treaty concluded. But now that a prospect for creating unified Germany has emerged, it turns out as though a peace treaty has, as it were, become redundant. It seems to me that this is a way of getting away from tackling a number of problems. Moreover, it is a way that gives rise to many questions. The main one is: Why is it that there is this desire to get away from concluding a peace treaty which should put an end both to the Second World War and the cold war and which should cancel the special powers which the four powers, the main victorious powers have had up until now and which, without a peace treaty, will continue in perpetuity. It is in the interests of Germany itself, it is in the interests of all, I think, to have this legal puzzle resolved.

As for NATO: Here I think, we are dealing with guile, if you will allow me to use this elegant expression. NATO emerged not as a factor for stability, but out of other considerations. NATO was the main product of the cold war and an instrument of this war. And if today we wish to extend the lifetime of NATO, having curtailed the lifespan of other organizations that oppose NATO, we will thereby destroy the balance of interests that has taken shape in Europe and we will lead to such a change in the correlation of forces that the other side—the Soviet Union in this instance—will, naturally, hardly be able to agree to.

This is because NATO is not merely a European factor. NATO is a global factor. It is a part of military confrontation, of the correlation of forces, the military configuration between the USSR and the United States and we have no right to become oblivious of this fact. I will put one question to you. You may refrain from answering, since the answer is clear in advance.

If we are all saying that a neutral, or to be more specific, a militarily neutralized Germany is not suitable, if we wish to boil things down to demonstrating that no major conflicts have taken place in Europe within the framework of the existing structures over the past 45 years, none of this represents the proof or justification in favor of NATO remaining, NATO continuing to live, so that this cold war relic can enter the 21st century with us. Yes, the existing structure of NATO and Warsaw Pact can surely continue to function if they are transitional systems, they can continue to function for some time, but only as a transitional stage leading to something else. We call it the all-European security system.

What do you have in mind? I can again recall what a British politician said: This former foreign secretary, while still in his post, expressed his idea thus: A divided Europe presupposes a divided Germany. Unification of Germany within the framework of a divided Europe poses a threat to us all. This is not a Soviet appraisal, but a British appraisal. This was true a long time ago; it is, likewise, true today. What sort of models are put forward for Germany itself, to say nothing of anyone else? The Western part of the present FRG would be a NATO member, the present GDR and its territory would become neutralized—neutrality no longer plays quite the same part here. This means that it is not just Europe, but Germany, too, which would have two security systems. This seems to me so abstract, not to say absurd, if you take concrete details, that it is hardly possible to speak of a practical approach, a serious approach.

And the main thing: If the inclusion of a united Germany in NATO is needed because some people do not trust the Germans, some people are afraid that they may again take their own, special road, then allow me to ask why nuclear weapons are needed on their territory. Do you, NATO, intend to use these weapons against Germans if they behave differently to what you expect? After all, you—I mean the NATO countries—do not intend to continue to keep nuclear weapons on their territory for this purpose. So let us call a spade a spade.

The hour of truth has now struck—everything ought to be put on the table, so that we can see where we are. This is because we must decide for ourselves whether we intend to have conflict or whether we intend to cooperate.

Do we intend to ensure our security by political or by military means? We offer you political means. We offer—without discriminating against anyone, Germany included—we offer to find such models that will bring benefits to everyone.

Finally, let me again return to the subject of a peace treaty. We do not propose to you that a classical peace treaty, one between the victors and the vanquished, should be concluded. What we propose is a treaty which

will also please Germany itself as a signatory to the treaty. This treaty will, to some extent, perhaps represent a step ahead of European developments, a step which will promise that all future inhabitants of the common European home have a definite military status, a step which will give this message to Germany: Have exactly as much as you need for sensible and sufficient defense, a step which will say to Germany: Do not let your territory be used against anyone at all, or for creating a new danger of war emanating from your soil. Or, to put it the way Federal Chancellor Kohl does: Only peace should emanate from the German territory.

We are for it. Our relations, according to the Moscow Treaty, rest upon the basis that violence has been renounced. What not make this principle an all-European one? And if you make it all-European, then we must ask ourselves: Why do we need so much by way of arms? Currently the amount of arms on the territory of Germany, both Germanys, is between 15 and 20 times greater than the average for Europe. Is this what we have all been striving for? Is this something that can be preserved for a long time? So, let us ask ourselves these questions and may be then we will find common answers.

[Zorin] I can see that both Mr. Ambassador Blech and Sir Rodric wish to express their points of view. Since our time is running out, I suggest that in conclusion each participant tell us about his idea of what scenario of developments in Germany he regards as being the most acceptable. Mr. Ambassador, please go ahead.

[Blech] To start with, the scenario you have asked about. We in Germany should adhere to two scenarios. The first one is about the way in which relations between both German states will be developing. On the one hand, it depends on what kind of government will be in place in the GDR and when this takes place. After all, the Federal FRG Government will hold talks with this government on all the issues due to be settled to define the joint path toward unification. This is in all probability what the GDR Government also thinks. This will not be taking place as quickly as many people fear. Nor will it take as long as many people hope, perhaps. it is simply that the pressure, the natural expectations and the hopes of the population of the German states cannot but be taken into consideration by the representatives of the government of both German states.

Second, the international context, the international aspects of German unification must be clarified. when we act according to the scenario of international talks this process will have to be speeded up as far as the external aspects of unification are concerned. This is because the synchronization of the process itself does not merely involve the slowing down of the motion of one of the trains—this, after all, may result in an accident and not one of the governments is interested in this. But I can say one thing quite categorically. I could get allies here, I could here quote the federal president or the federal chancellor, the foreign minister and many other politicians. The entire process must be conducted by us with great responsibility not only for our people, but also the whole of Europe. Everyone can rest assured that here we will have to make full use of our imagination and constructive approach. We will show our utmost respect for the feelings of our neighbors. This goes without saying.

[Zorin] Sir Rodric?

[Braithwaite] Thank you very much. I wish to quote Mr. Gorbachev. During the meeting with Weizsaecker three years ago and in his book on perestroyka two years ago he said history would solve the German question and that 100 years would be needed for that—this is what, it seems, he said. Six months ago, not a single one of us sitting round this table could have foreseen that today we would be using such words when discussing German unification. The process has accelerated.

[Zorin] And no one could have foreseen such composition, either?

[Braithwaite] Yes, it may well be so. Of course I do not fortell the future. We British always have a very pragmatic attitude to what is going on. We have always been accused of that. We are even charged in the European Community with being altogether unable to foresee things. It seems to me, however, that a complex situation such as we have with the German unification presupposes several scenarios. Moreover, conflicting viewpoints exist both between the Soviet Union and its partners and between the Western partners on how to achieve solution of all questions which have been there since the Second World War. I think that this will be better than concluding peace treaties. It now seems to me perfectly clear that given the institutions that we now have we can resolve these questions through the talks we hold. This is something that is desired both in Germany and in the Soviet Union and in Great Britain and generally everywhere else. We can reach a common solution in some way. I can not foretell specifically what it will be. We need to find a solution that satisfies everyone, a solution which will have a juridicial, legal basis, one which will solve all the questions which pertain to politics, security, and economics alike, questions which have remained with us since the Second World War. I hope we will solve all these problems. But generally I am averse to forecasting specific ways of tackling the question.

[Zorin] Thank you.

[Blech] Forgive me, but I would particularly like to emphasize the following as regard a peace treaty, and, generally, it also applies to the security issue: We must clarify what individual problems which we must solve on a legal basis without fail are. We do not generally dispute the existence of these problems. If we determine what represents a more apt solution we will then be able to define the form in which these can be implemented. But

we cannot determine the content of a solution proceeding from the form alone. This pertains to the security issue, since this question must itself be seen in its context.

[Zorin] Valentin Mikhaylovic? Please conclude.

[Falin] Yes. The first thing that I would like to say, since Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has been mentioned, is that President Gorbachev has quite recently touched on his statement that history will decide Germany's future. He noted that history quickened its march well above anyone's expectations. The second thing is this: I would like to note that today Europe's future—not past, but its future—depends on us: on two plus four, other Europeans, including Poland, since its interests will be involved and Yugoslavia, since its interests will also surely be involved and these countries should also make their views known within the settlement process, depends what Europe will be, precisely what it will be and not what it was. The most important thing is that we, having placed a full stop in the chapter which we all consider to an equal degree to be not the very best in the history of civilization, might be confident ourselves to say to those who continue our task: We have done everything incumbent on us to make Europe's future and present better than what we have all inherited.

[Zorin] Thank you. Our time on the air has run out. I suspect we shall have occasion to discuss on more occasions here in Studio Nine the German problem. It is no doubt not a problem which is to be solved quickly and easily. But for now I must thank you for taking part in this conversation, to thank our viewers for their attention until our next meetings here in Studio Nine. Thank you.

WEU Session Discusses European Security Problems

German Issue Highlighted

LD0304215890 Moscow TASS in English 2142 GMT 3 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS—The questions of Germany's unification were highlighted at a meeting on Tuesday between a delegation of the Western European Union [WEU] led by president of its assembly Charles Goerens and staff members of the Institute of Europe, USSR Academy of Sciences.

The delegation is in the USSR on an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The sides expressed the common opinion that the issues of the two Germanies' unification should be examined strictly within the framework of the European process.

Later in the day the delegation had a meeting at the USSR Foreign Ministry.

Goerens Views Europe's Future

PM0404134990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[Special correspondents V. Bolshakov and V. Peresada dispatch: "Bridge Across the Abyss, or Thoughts on Europe's Future"]

[Text] Luxembourg—A graceful red-and-white bridge soars like an arrow over the deep valley which divides the capital of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg. Most of the city, where old palaces and castles jostle with modern multistory steel and concrete buildings, is one one side of the valley. On the other side is the wooded Kirshberg [name as transliterated] district, the site of a complex of buildings known as "Eurocenter."

A few days ago an extraordinary session of the Western European Union (WEU) was held there. There are nine countries in this organization—Britain, Belgium, the Netherlands, Spain, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal, France, and the FRG. The session was aimed at elaborating recommendations for the WEU Council—the association's executive organ—on the entire range of European security problems under the new conditions and taking account of the rapid changes in the east of our continent.

Defining One's Place

As one of the session participants put it, they were meeting to "define our place at a time of change." This is of considerable importance for the WEU and, clearly, is not so simple if we bear in mind that throughout its history the union has played by no means an independent role. Set up in 1955 as an instrument for controlling FRG armaments, it gradually evolved into a multifaceted military-political organization empowered to resolve defense policy issues in West Europe without U.S. participation.

Of course, in actual fact the union has always toed the NATO line and seen itself as the "European leg" of NATO and, since the organization did not have its own armed forces, was something akin to a second fiddle in the West's cold war orchestra. By the early eighties its activities had in general become unnoticeable and many newspapers even said that the WEU was dormant.

The galvanization of "European initiatives" in world politics, the growing rapprochement between East and West, and particularly the changes in the east of the continent—all this stirred up the WEU, as it were. After all, despite everything, we were told here, it is just a purely European mechanism which could make a substantial contribution to building the new Europe.

Incidentally, the main report presented to a session of the assembly's political committee was called "Establishing a Procedure for Justice, Peace, and Security on the Continent—Prospects Opened Up by the Evolution in Central and East Europe." These are curious documents. It is probably the first time in the WEU's 35-year

existence that the assessments it contains on the military-strategic position in Europe and the world have been made from the perspective of dialogue and cooperation rather than confrontation with the East. And in some areas they seem more flexible and constructive than NATO's approaches, which are also currently under renewal.

Just which of these assessments attract the greatest attention?

First, the conclusion that the changes in East Europe, which were initiated by perestroyka in the USSR, have opened up real opportunities for building a peaceful and just order on the continent. On this basis, the report states, the West should embark on reviewing the defense system based on former concepts. While advocating the retention of existing military-political alliances, the report's authors believe at the same time that this system has ceased to be necessary and could even be an obstacle to safeguarding peace and security in Europe. Continuing cooperation with NATO—not least with a view to defending the "Atlantic region"—is still termed very important, but the WEU is no longer talked of as NATO's "European leg" but as a "lever for a new security system in Europe."

What is understood by this concept? You will not find a clear-cut concept in the section of recommendations—and it could hardly be expected to take shape so quickly. But the trend is noticeable in its elaboration.

Also typical is the emerging approach in the WEU toward the problem of German unification. It was noted in Luxembourg that this prospect is welcomed, but, at the same time, the European states are concerned both about the question of guaranteeing the inviolability of existing European borders and about the future military-political status of a united Germany. The report directly states—and for the first time in any document produced by a Western grouping—that many central and East European countries consider it unacceptable for a united Germany to be part of NATO. And—again for the first time—unlike NATO documents the proposal is expressed that a united Germany be integrated into a collective European security system in which the United States and Canada would participate.

The President Speaks

...We talked with Charles Goerens, president of the WEU Assembly. Many people link his name with the line which the organization has recently followed with regard to the USSR and its allies. He is young, energetic, and answered our questions precisely and clearly—as if he knew what we were going to ask beforehand. You felt that he had not only the good political schooling but also the high culture necessary for figures of such a rank.

[Correspondents] What prompted the extraordinary Luxembourg session?

[Goerens] The need to react urgently to the challenge of the time. The processes taking place in East Europe require that all the basic information about the problem of safeguarding security on the continent be rethought. An unprecedented opportunity is emerging to build a really new order in Europe based on consideration for each other's interests—the interests of East and West.

[Correspondents] How can you explain the following WEU approach: It simultaneously advocates common European structures and wants to abandon the bloc system?

[Goerens] I believe the establishment of a new peace and security system in Europe will be a phased process. In our short- and medium-term plans we should maintain the current alliances if only for the simple reason that they are instruments of dialogue. Moreover, they could promote the maintenance of stability—all the more so as alarming signs of a weakening of stability are currently to be seen in a number of European regions. Finally there is the military sphere. We still need to do a great deal to gradually minimize the level of arms capable of safeguarding security. It is already being proposed that the current CFE-1 [Conventional Armed Forces in Europe] talks in Vienna will be followed by CFE-2 and then maybe CFE-3. And instruments of dialogue and verification will be needed for as long as this process lasts. So the existing alliances are needed in the light of these prospects.

[Correspondents] Just what role could the WEU play in the future in relations between East and West Europe?

[Goerens] I think it would be a unifying role. For instance, we are already conducting a dialogue with the USSR Supreme Soviet. The current dialogue structures could also be useful in the future to a certain extent. Since the WEU is the only organization entitled to deal with security matters within West Europe, I do not think that anybody else could replace it in that role.

[Correspondents] What is your attitude to the idea of a common European home?

[Goerens] I should admit that just two years ago I did not believe in it. But now I'm starting to. And I'm working on the basis that the Europe which emerged after the Yalta agreements is disappearing. In all spheres—the economy, politics, and culture—cooperation is under way and collaboration is being organized on security matters and confidence-building measures. I should also note that the EC and the common European home are complementary rather than contradictory factors. Ultimately, in my view, everything will be determined through the Helsinki process. I am optimistic about the future, although, of course, I do not think that it will be easy to build a common home in Europe. [Goerens ends]

From Dream to Reality

Working in two West European capitals, we are able to see for ourselves that people in West Europe are realizing

more and more clearly that the continent has now been given a chance to restructure its life in such as way as to ensure that a stable world ceases to be merely a dream. But here is what is important: Will the end results correspond to the qualitatively new premises objectively existing today for such restructuring? Or, as has already happened in the past on many occasions, will short-term interests be given preference over long-term interests? After all, along with realistic assessments, there have also been the former stereotyped approaches based on the desire for unilateral advantage. For instance, voices have been heard—and there are many of them—in favor of a unified Germany within NATO. Or there have been the statements that the Soviet Union has still not done its bit for disarmament—as if the Western countries had already done theirs. Such opinions cannot be disregarded, since they largely determine the West's policy even under the new conditions. And whether or not Europe succeeds in grasping its historic opportunity will depend on which trends prevail.

We asked V.M. Falin, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee and a participant in the Luxembourg session, to share his impressions of the session and assess the importance of our dialogue with the WEU.

"The session," he said, "reflected a certain lack of confidence on the part of the WEU participants as regards the future of their union. Given the changes that are occurring, what place will this union have in all-European or even West European structures in one, five, or 10 years' time? For instance, the following idea was voiced: Europeans should shoulder more responsibility for ensuring that this is not decided by the classic military confrontation option typical of NATO's activity. But, in general, people here went no further than making such statements.

At the same time, a number of interesting arguments were heard. Maybe these do not coincide with our ideas, but they provide grounds for additionally checking ourselves and thinking things over again. [quotation marks as published]

...We bade farewell to Luxembourg and crossed the bridge over the valley for the last time. One of us was returning to Paris, the other to Brussels. For us now this bridge is a symbol. After all, Europe today is indeed building a bridge of mutual understanding across the abyss of enmity and mistrust which has long divided the East and West of our continent.

Zagladin Talks With Delegation

LD0504082590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1600 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 Apr (TASS)—Questions of European security and problems of the unification of the two German states—these themes were discussed deeply during the conversations which members of the Western European Union (WEU) Assembly delegation, which is in Moscow, held today in the USSR Supreme Soviet Committees for International Affairs, and for Defense and State Security Issues, and also in the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation.

"If, until recently, diplomacy and defense had a particularly national character and coalitions and blocs were created on that basis, now collective diplomacy and collective security are necessary." This was how Vadim Zagladin, chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, at the meeting with the West European parliamentarians formulated the tasks as they are seen in the Soviet Union in the period of transition from the policy of the cold war. Noting the problems of the unification of the two German states, the Soviet figure said that this is an objective process, however, it should not violate the parity that has developed in Europe and the existing borders. In his words, no one yet has the definitive solutions. Therefore, searches should be carried out jointly within the framework of the "two plus four" mechanism and with the involvement of the 35 states participating in the pan-European process, he stressed. "Solutions by stages and interim solutions are possible along the path to solving the German question," Vadim Zagladin said.

Members of the WEU Assembly delegation also came out in favor of the future Germany, and also Europe as a whole not becoming the place for the outbreak of a new war. It was revealed during the exchange of opinions that the question of the creation of a "pan- European" security system of WEU member countries relates to the long-term. Today they are in favor of the preservation of blocs, which, in the opinion of Western parliamentarians, serve as the guarantor of stability and carry out the functions of monitoring the observation of treaties. At the same time, the WEU Assembly is in favor of the development of dialogoue with the USSR. As a delegation member said in a conversation with a TASS correspondent, "it is time to go over from meetings of parliamentarians to contacts at the level of ministers of foreign affairs and of defense." Asked about the prospects of the Vienna talks process, Charles Goerens, head of the delegation and president of the Assembly noted: "The WEU understands the preoccupation of the Soviet Union with problems of security and military parity. The talks should continue after the signing of an agreement on conventional armed forces, too." "It is not ruled out that tactical nuclear weapons will be the subject of future talks," he said. "In any event, NATO ought to make such a proposal after consultations with its allies."

Soviet Interest in Council of Europe Noted

PM0404122990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with Ambassador at Large Yu.B. Kashlev, by correspondent L. Kostanyan in Lisbon under the rubric "IZVESTIYA Interview"; date of interview not specified; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction: "Path to a New Europe"]

[Text] A Committee of Ministers session of the Council of Europe, an intergovernmental organization uniting 23 states of the continent's western part on a political humanitarian basis, was held a few days ago in Lisbon. The present session was unusual. The foreign affairs ministers of seven East European countries were invited to it. Mutual relations in the East-West context were discussed in the light of the new situation in Europe. After the session ended, an IZVESTIYA correspondent had a conversation with Ambassador at Large Yu.B. Kashlev, who represented USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs E.A. Shevardnadze at the forum.

[Kashlev] This was the first joint discussion at such a high level within the Council of Europe about Europe's future. I think that the remark made in his welcoming address by the president of Portugal, Mario Soares, that such a meeting became possible only in the conditions produced by the changes which are occurring in Europe, thanks chiefly to "Gorbachev's perestroyka," is entirely justified. In direct connection with the renewal of Europe, it is also necessary to examine the Council of Europe's political decision, adopted in principle, to open the doors to relations with its eastern neighbors and talk as equals, as between partners.

[Kostanyan] It is known that Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria have already submitted official applications to become members of the Council of Europe. Czechoslovakia made this request directly during this session. The USSR minister of foreign affairs said in our press that the Soviet Union does not want to be confined to the status of a "specially invited guest." How are things going with our entry to the Council of Europe?

[Kashlev] We are progressing to membership of this organization in stages. We are now working on the question of joining the Council of Europe's first seven conventions. The go-ahead has also been given to our joining the European cultural convention, one of the Council of Europe's most important conventions. We have already started to develop active parliamentary contacts. Our proposal that the Soviet Union participate as a permanent observer in meetings of the Committee of Ministers was received with interest. You know that the main condition of entry to the Council of Europe is the creation of a pluralist democracy. We believe that our country is developing in precisely this direction. We have irrevocably embarked on this path and intend to consolidate our links with the Council of Europe, having in mind the creation of a council of one greater democratic Europe.

[Kostanyan] Doesn't this consign to oblivion the structure elaborated by the Helsinki process?

[Kashlev] Not at all. I believe the Council of Europe structures could be utilized in the context of the all-European process. For example, we introduced a motion to create a Committee of Ministers of CSCE countries. The present Council of Europe Committee of Ministers could serve as a model for such an organ. We think the Council of Europe parliamentary assembly can also be a prototype for an all-European parliamentary organization. As a whole the Council of Europe should be seen as a support structure for a future European home housing 35 countries.

Our view is that the question of using the Council of Europe format to create all-European structures involving the 35 countries can be discussed at this fall's forthcoming CSCE summit.

[Kostanyan] We have glimpsed the future of Europe. Can it be said that we are getting near to realizing the idea of a "common European home"?

[Kashlev] The idea of a "common European home" is a strategic concept. We speak of a "common European home," Mitterrand speaks of a "European confederation," others speak of a "new order," or a "new European architecture".... I believe it is necessary to progress in all directions—within the context of the CSCE structure, within the context of expanding the Council of Europe to the proportions of a council of greater Europe, and within the context of changing the role of military blocs right as far as their elimination. All roads which lead to Mecca are good roads.

Vienna Seminar Views Conversion Issues

PM0404155790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS-attributed Yu. Novak dispatch: "Attention Focusing on Conversion"]

[Text] Vienna, 2 Apr—Problems of the joint quest for scientific substantiation of the concept of preparing and implementing conversion of military production, the exchange of experience, and the subsequent elaboration of an international scientific project for research in this sphere—these were the questions on which attention focused at an international seminar held in the Austrian capital. The initiative to hold it came from the International Peace Institute, which invited to Austria scientists from various countries— including the USSR, the United States, Bulgaria, Norway, the GDR, and Poland.

The seminar devoted special attention to the fact that there is no need to create new political structures in order to solve the problems of conversion. Existing institutions and organizations in each country can cope with this task by themselves. The difficulty is that the process of converting sectors and enterprises to the production of civilian output could be accompanied by serious negative consequences unless there is an accurately worked out and scientifically substantiated plan. Given such a plan, scientists are of the opinion that any major military enterprise could be converted to the manufacture of consumer goods within a period of between one and three years.

The seminar's tasks, L. Voronkov, scientific director of the International Peace Institute, said in conversation with a TASS correspondent, comprise a joint quest by scientists in East and West for the best possible model for painlessly implementing conversion of military production while taking into account the specific national features of the condition of different industrial sectors and the development of the military-industrial complex.

The seminar participants were unanimous that today there is a need for comprehensive new studies to back up the ideas of new political thinking with economic calculations so as to dispel fears and convince everyone that disarmament and conversion are not just a commandment of the time but also a manageable process.

Urals Enterprises' Cooperation Suggested

PM0504085990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 90 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Interested in Conversion"]

[Text] Bonn, 4 Apr—"On the possibilities of the Urals' international cooperation on the basis of the conversion of defense sectors of industry"—the press conference held on this subject by a Soviet delegation at the conference under way here on economic cooperation in Europe has generated lively interest among representatives of the West's business circles and mass media.

The considerable capacities of the Urals region's enterprises are geared to the production of defense output, the Soviet experts noted. Even their partial transfer to a conversion footing opens up broad opportunities for improving the state of the Soviet consumer market and developing cooperation with foreign partners. The leaders of Urals defense enterprises who spoke described in detail the progress of conversion and the production of civilian output which has already begun. The list is quite extensive: from washing machines and metal fittings for furniture to power trucks, aviation instruments, and engines. There are proposals to exchange information and carry out joint developments in the field of new technologies.

Procurator Interviewed on Barcelona Congress

LD0404124590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 4 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] The right of nations to self-determination is one of the most topical problems of our time: How can it be interpreted from the view point of legal norms? This was one of the problems discussed at the 13th Congress of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, which took place in the Spanish city of Barcelona.

[Correspondent Gorkayev] [passage omitted] One of the most topical issues examined at the congress was that of the right of nations to self-determination. What conclusions did the lawyers reach?

[Begin video recording of A.Ya. Sukharev, USSR chief procurator and chief of the Soviet delegation, interviewed in foyer] There was a common view on one thing: that these issues can be resolved based on the established international legal norms and established traditions and taking account of all the interests both of the peoples who inhabit any republic and of the peoples who inhabit any state or any sort of autonomous formation; and, of course, taking account of all the interests of those nations and ethnic groups that are directly linked economically, socially and, I would say, historically. It is important to take into consideration the entire range of problems. This was the unanimous and prevailing opinion at the congress. [end recording] [passage omitted]

United States & Canada

Gorbachev To Visit U.S. 30 May-3 June

LD0504135490 Moscow TASS in English 1348 GMT 5 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 5 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev will pay a visit to the United States between May 30 and June 3 under an agreement that has been reached, it was announced here.

Further Reportage on Shevardnadze's Visit to U.S.

IZVESTIYA on Shevardnadze Remarks

PM0404151990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Arrival in Washington"]

[Text] E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, left Moscow for Washington 3 April on a working visit. During his forthcoming talks with U.S. President G. Bush and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker the chief attention will be focused on questions of preparing the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in the summer of this year.

E.A. Shevardnadze arrived in the U.S. capital 4 April. At Andrews Air Force Base near Washington he was met by L. Eagleburger, U.S. first deputy secretary of state, and other U.S. officials. Yu.V. Dubinin, USSR ambassador to the United States, and J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR, were among the welcoming party.

Upon his arrival E.A. Shevardnadze made the following statement:

"A very important event in the political life of our countries—the Soviet Union and the United States—is approaching—the summit meeting. A very large amount of creative work is under way on all avenues. A very large amount of work has been done to prepare the relevant documents on reductions of strategic offensive arms. There are good amounts of groundwork but there is also the need to do further work. That is the first thing.

"Second. There is a need to consult on how to accelerate the Vienna talks on conventional armaments and as a whole on problems of stability in Europe. There is also a need to consult on problems of accelerating work and completing preparation on the convention on banning chemical weapons. There is a large amount of groundwork on this plane, too.

"I think that at the summit meeting we will be able to achieve serious breakthroughs in the field of bilateral relations. I have in mind economic relations, trade, science, and technology.

"And one more avenue. It is a traditional question on our agenda—regional conflicts. Recently a very interesting and promising trend has emerged, the trend toward collaboration between the Soviet Union and the United States in various regions of the world. There will be positive talks with the secretary of state, Mr Baker, and I know a meeting with the president is planned.

"I think that one more meeting at minister level will be needed before the summit meeting to bring to the necessary standard those documents which will be signed at the summit meeting."

The USSR foreign minister was asked: "Many people in Washington think that the events in Lithuania and your government's actions could impede progress in preparing the summit meeting. What guarantees can you give Washington during this visit regarding your actions in Lithuania?"

Answer: "To answer formally, I could put it like this: It is an internal matter for the Soviet Union and we will act as we consider necessary. But, on the other hand, that would probably be wrong. I understand Americans' feelings in connection with the events in Lithuania. Our planet is indeed integral and united and everything taking place in one corner of the planet finds a painful echo in another part of the planet. I remember that, when you had a catastrophe, a natural disaster in California, every Soviet person was ready to stand alongside the Americans at the time. And every Soviet person also assesses highly the Americans' support—moral, political, and material—in the days of the disaster in our own Armenia. But cataclysms do not happen only in nature. Cataclysms also happen in sociopolitical life in various countries, including in the Soviet Union. That is why I want to say that I treat with understanding the Americans' concern for the future of Lithuania and the Lithuanian people. But you must also understand the importance of this question for the Soviet people and the Soviet republics. You must also understand the degree of concern of Soviet people, of the Soviet people, for the fate of Lithuania, the Lithuanian people, and indeed the entire Union. And for the fate of the Constitution. You know that we are working on a new constitution. But in the meantime the existing Constitution is in operation. And any people in any state respect the existing Constitution. How will we act? We will act within the limits and the framework of the Constitution. That is within the limits and the framework of the fundamental law of our country, for which the Lithuanian people voted together with other peoples. That is the first point.

"And the second point. I have already had occasion to mention this but I want to say it once again. Our main weapon in resolving any question within the country and in relations with other states is dialogue.

"Honest dialogue. It is precisely on this dialogue that we are counting in relations with the Lithuanian people and the Lithuanian leadership."

Three-Day Talks Outlined

LD0504065590 Moscow TASS in English 0615 GMT 5 Apr 90

[Text] Washington April 5 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, who has arrived in Washington on a working visit, and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker began their talks with a one-on-one meeting here on Wednesday.

The talks' agenda includes arms control, bilateral relations, including in trade and economy, regional problems, humanitarian relations and transnational issues.

Answering reporters' questions Wednesday morning, Baker said that the American side would also like to receive full information about the developments in Lithuania and about the Soviet leaders' approach to them.

He noted with satisfaction the readiness of both sides for dialogue.

"We are anxious to see these developments proceed peacefully and be resolved through dialogue," Baker said.

Shevardnadze and Baker will continue their negotiations on Thursday when a plenary meeting and three rounds of talks between smaller delegations will be held.

On Friday, the Soviet minister is expected to meet President George Bush and have another one-on-one meeting with Baker, the sides also plan to hold one more plenary meeting and a fourth round of talks on disarmament issues.

Upon the conclusion of the talks, Shevardnadze and Baker will give news conferences.

The three-day talks are being held to prepare a June summit between President Bush and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Upon his arrival in Washington, Shevardnadze said that "much creative work has already been done in all areas." Yet, he pointed to the need to continue that work and said another ministerial meeting might be needed.

Shevardnadze-Baker Hold Talks

LD0504053690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0230 GMT 5 Apr 90

[Text] [Presenter] Boris Kolyagin, our correspondent in Washington is on the line. The topic of our conversation is Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze's working visit to the United States. And so, hello Washington, do you hear me?

[Kolyagin] Yes, I hear you well.

[Presenter] Good morning! It is known...

[Kolyagin, interrupting] In Washington it is still late evening, but good morning, of course.

[Presenter] Well we say good morning from habit. It is known that the first meeting between Shevardnadze and Baker has already taken place. Are any details known?

[Kolyagin] Yes. The meeting began after midnight Moscow time, and this was the first meeting of the two ministers during the current visit. It lasted almost 3 and ½ hours and passed in a spirit of frankness and in a constructive atmosphere. The ministers determined the agenda of the talks and the procedure for work. They began their discussion of issues of disarmament and in particular considered a number of aspects of the agreements on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons which are being prepared. Much attention was devoted to bilateral relations. A whole package of serious accords between the Soviet Union and the United States on various issues is now planned.

The ministers informed one another about the situations in their countries, and a discussion of the Lithuanian problem occupied a special place. Comrade Shevardnadze pointed out that the Soviet leadership is striving to settle the situation in Lithuania on the basis of a dialogue, without the application of force and taking into account the interests of both Lithuania and the whole Soviet state.

[Presenter] Boris, I would like to interrupt you here, I'm sorry. I wonder, how is the U.S. press reporting the events, elucidating the events in Lithuania, taking into account Shevardnadze's visit to Washington?

[Kolyagin] Well, there is, of course, a great deal of interest. The first reports were located on the main pages of the newspapers. I should say that there are some not very pleasant aspects here, as well. Right-wing circles, in the first instance right-wing Lithuanian emigres, are trying to complicate the course of the talks. They arranged a noisy demonstration today at the State Department building and at the USSR Embassy. But the dialogue is continuing, although not under simple conditions. And so the newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST writes, incidentally, in connection with this, that the Lithuanian situation has had little effect on the positive attitude of the U.S. public to Gorbachev's policies and has not led to any changes in U.S. views at the talks for new agreements with the USSR on arms control.

[Presenter] Well, is this on the whole a typical pronouncement for the U.S. press, or is this some kind of selective article which sounds positive?

[Kolyagin] This is, of course, an analytical article. A very great deal of attention is being devoted to the situation around Lithuania. The pronouncements are different, but this same WASHINGTON POST, together with the U.S. television company ABC news conducted an opinion poll in which it was made clear that an absolute

majority of Americans, 59 percent, support the U.S. President's weighed and realistic approach to the Lithuanian issue.

[Presenter] And now let us return again to Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze's working visit again. What is the program for today?

[Kolyagin] Today is the second day of the Soviet-U.S. talks and of quite intensive ones, I should say. There will be a plenary sitting of the Soviet-U.S. delegation. At it, tasks will be set for the working groups set up for the discussion and preparation of recommendations on the main problems of the international situation and bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations. Three rounds of talks, involving limited numbers, will also take place, at which issues of disarmament, regional problems, and also humanitarian, transnational and economic issues will be discussed. So, much and very painstaking work lies ahead. But the results of it will become known only tomorrow.

[Presenter] Yes, I just wanted to say that tomorrow, all of this will take place, taking the time difference into account, some time when it is late evening in Moscow and so...

[Kolyagin, interrupting] Yes, of course, and as far as Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze's news conference upon completion of the talks is concerned, it is obvious that we will be able to inform our listeners and television viewers about this only on Saturday morning.

[Presenter] Saturday morning. Well thank you Boris. Goodbye. That was a report by Boris Kolyagin from Washington.

[Kolyagin] Goodbye.

Baker, Shevardnadze on First Meeting

LD0504083790 Moscow TASS in English 0627 GMT 5 Apr 90

[Text] Washington April 5 TASS—The first one-to-one meeting between U.S. Secretary James Baker and visiting Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze ended on Wednesday night [4 April].

The meeting, which was scheduled to last two hours, actually lasted three and a half. At the close of the meeting the two ministers told journalists about their satisfaction with the start of the talks.

Baker said that much time during the first round was devoted to the discussion of arms control issues and the situation in Lithuania. An agenda for Thursday's talks between the two delegations was also agreed.

"It is very important that we discussed the agenda." Shevardnadze said. "We also tentatively discussed a number of items on the agenda. It is too early to speak of results so far. Thursday morning we begin intensive talks on disarmament. Then we shall discuss other matters. A vast amount of meticulous work lies ahead."

Shevardnadze said that he informed the U.S. secretary of state in detail of the situation in Lithuanian and of the Soviet leadership's approach to a settlement of the existing problems.

"Let me tell you very authoritativley and seriously that I have no doubt that we will be able to find a solution to that situation, that we will find a wise and fair solution that will be consistent with the interests of the Lithuanian people and our union and, what is more, with the interests of Europe and the world," Shevardnadze added.

In an answer to reporters' questions, Baker said that during the talks the Soviet side once again emphasised that it considered dialogue the only correct way to solve problems concerning Lithuania and this is precisely what the United States supports.

The U.S. secretary of state said he set out the administration's position on Lithuanian and stressed that solving existing problems through dialogue was important for Soviet-American relations.

"This is a very, very important matter," Baker said, "I have pointed out to the minister how very important it is in terms of the relationships between the United States and the Soviet Union."

Baker said there were no disagreements with Shevardnadze "with respect to its importance, and with respect to the importance of resolving it through dialogue and through peaceful means."

Talks will begin in the State Department Thursday morning, with the sides to discuss arms control and disarmament issues.

On Friday, Shevardnadze will meet U.S. President George Bush in the White House and will have the second one-to-one meeting with the U.S. secretary of state. Shevardnadze and Baker are scheduled to hold a news conference on Friday night.

Shevardnadze, U.S. Senators Meet

LD0504084890 Moscow TASS in English 0640 GMT 5 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Igor Borisenko]

[Text] Washington April 5 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze met U.S. Senate Democratic majority leader George Mitchell and Senate Republican minority leader Robert Dole at the Soviet Embassy here on Wednesday evening.

During the meeting which lasted for over an hour, the sides discussed U.S.-Soviet relations, dealt with the situation in Lithuania and the approach of the Soviet leadership to settling the existing problems.

"It is difficult for the time being to appraise the talks," Shevardnadze told TASS. "This is only the first day. We compiled our agenda and began to discuss some issues.

"These are mostly preparations for an agreement on 50 per cent cuts in strategic offensive weapons. We also discussed other problems. Great interest was displayed in perestroyka in our country. Many questions were asked about Lithuania.

"I'd like to say that people want to understand what is going on. I have in mind both top leaders and ordinary people. They want to have a full idea of what the difficulties are and where the way out is.

"I cannot say that this is a confrontational approach. There is concern about Lithuania and the Lithuanian people and, maybe, even greater concern over the destiny of perestroyka."

Asked about his assessment of the present state of Soviet- American relations, Shevardnadze replied: "I believe that we now cooperate at a good level. When the President speaks about a new closeness between our countries, when President Gorbachev says that we cannot regard the United States as an enemy and when we are engaged in constant contacts and a constant dialogue both at the top level and between ministers, relations develop in the full meaning of this word.

"I believe that this is the best indicator of our relations influencing the political climate in the world."

U.S. Impressions of Shevardnadze Visit Viewed

LD0504110690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 5 Apr 90

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Yuriy Isayev]

[Text] USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze's visit to the United States is undoubtedly the number one topic today. Our minister's first one-to-one meeting with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker ended yesterday evening. It lasted more than three hours. The gamut of Soviet-U.S. relations, the preparations for the new summit, and arms limitation issues were discussed. Problems of concluding new agreements in this sphere were examined in detail.

During the meeting Comrade Shevardnadze and Secretary Baker exchanged information on the internal political situation in the USSR and the United States. The topic of Lithuania became one of the main points. The head of the Soviet foreign policy department confirmed the Soviet leadership's desire to firmly adhere to the policy of perestroyka and democratization and to tackle issues through peaceful and constructive dialogue.

Comrade Shevardnadze also received prominent U.S. senators: Mitchell, leader of the Democratic majority and Dole, leader of the Republican minority. During the exchange of views the Lithuanian question again was present. The Soviet leadership's position was confirmed once again: to settle the problem through a peaceful dialogue.

During the visit the U.S. State Department published a press release stressing that a historic opportunity has opened up for achieving a long-term improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations. The Soviet-U.S. talks are at the center of attention in the U.S. mass media. Many U.S. papers today note that this year may become the disarmament year. Accords not only in the area of 50-percent reductions in strategic arms, but also in the area of reducing conventional armed forces in Europe and eliminating chemical weapons are fully realistic.

It is the view of U.S. and foreign journalists covering the visit that the meeting in Washington facilitates the evolution from confrontation to mutual understanding, and in the longer term, to interaction between both countries. This is precisely what the Soviet-U.S. dialogue aims at. The clear statements of USSR President Gorbachev to the effect that the Soviet Union is ready to refrain from seeing the United States as an opponent and that it will under no circumstances start a war against it have made a strong impression in the United States.

Comrade Shevardnadze's visit is continuing. On Friday he will meet with U.S. President George Bush.

Radio Views Issues in Relations With U.S.

LD0404194890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, is now in the United States on a working visit. Today, when it will be late evening in Moscow, official talks are to open in Washington between Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze and James Baker, U.S. Secretary of State.

Here is our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver.

[Zholkver] Regular consultations between the heads of the USSR and U.S. foreign policy departments have of late already become a fine tradition. However, particular importance is being attached to the present talks. After all the main attention this time will be assigned to the preparations for the new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, scheduled for June this year.

On the threshhold of this meeting, both foreign ministers and the joint working groups will consider the whole complex of Soviet-U.S. relations. Attention will be focused on disarmament problems. After all preparations are being completed for the signing during the current year of a Soviet-U.S. agreement on reciprocal reductions of strategic nuclear armaments. After the treaty on eliminating U.S. and Soviet medium-range and short-range missiles, this will be the next most important step away from the abyss of a nuclear catastrophe.

Now when cardinal changes are occurring in the world, new additional opportunities are in general opening up for the development of Soviet-U.S. relations. I have been reading in the American press the most diverse projects

in this respect, ranging from the wish of 150 American companies to set up joint enterprises in our country to a program for joint flights to the moon and Mars.

However, I cannot fail to mention something else. Together with those in America who are hoping for the most diverse dividends of peace from the general improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations, there are the frightening voices of those who fear losing their former military dividends. I have seen figures in BUSINESS WEEK stating that the income of Lockheed Aircraft, one of the major producers of armaments, has indeed already been halved. This is why such a heated debate is now getting under way in the U.S. Congress about allocations for military programs. The intensity of the passions is being exacerbated even more by the prospect of the re-election this year of the whole membership of the House of Representatives and one third of the Senate.

In these conditions certain congressmen are also attempting to play the Lithuanian card. I think it is quite possible that this issue will also be raised during the present Washington talks. However it is noteworthy that the State Department official spokesman considered it necessary to specially note that discussion of the situation in Lithuania will not hamper the ministers' discussion on other points on the agenda, since they are of great importance.

Yes, very much indeed is presently at stake—the prospect not only of a radical improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations but also of a general enshrinement of the positive trends in world politics.

Ukrainian American on Need for Soviet 'Unity'

LD0504090990 Moscow TASS in English 0853 GMT 5 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Maslov]

[Text] New York April 5 TASS—The way democratic transformations in the Soviet Union evolve is now most closely connected with how the Lithuanian problem will be resolved, Walter Kovalchuk, editor of the U.S.-based UKRAINIAN NEWS, told TASS.

"We Ukrainian Americans are particularly worried by this question, since both in the land of our forefathers and among emigres, there are forces that have long been advocating secession," he said.

"The geography of the contemporary interdependent world, in which Lithuanian, Ukrainian and other peoples rely on centuries-old ties and traditions, cannot be artificially changed.

"The Lithuanians' desire to secede from the Soviet Union is not a simple misapprehension. Forces that embody nationalist egoism are playing on their sentiments by exploiting the difficulties of perestroyka.

"Of course, a democratic and non-violent solution should be found in the current situation, especially as, according to the U.S. press, by no means all Lithuanians want to secede.

"The time has come not to limit oneself only to good intentions. New laws are essential to reliably regulate relationships within the Soviet federation and not allow the arbitrariness of some nations to the detriment of others.

"Historical errors lead back to times when the slave-owing south sought to split from the American confederation. In those days it was the resolve of President Abraham Lincoln that helped keep the alliance intact and later on to create a more democratic and free United States," Kovalchuk said.

"Undoubtedly every people in the Soviet Union should have a real right to secede. However, it is apparently not fortuitous that West European countries are in no hurry to recognise 'independent Lithuania'. It is clear to everyone that the USSR's unity serves as a guarantor of order and peace on the continent.

"Secessionist sentiments do not square with West European countries' striving for a single market, for the establishment of universal border and customs regulations and the creation of the best conditions for economic and social development in a common European home.

"Emotions are being inflamed in Lithuania by those to whom the build-up of antagonism between peoples is convenient.

"This is also having an impact on relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. The way to the current relaxation of tension was too long and difficult for it to be undermined with ease.

"I believe that the future is for large law-governed states and alliances," Kovalchuk said. "Secessionist paths will not be of benefit to peoples. This is convincingly illustrated by our common historical experience," he said.

U.S. Senator To Visit Lithuania Without Visa

LD0404230290 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] It is reported that Alfonse d'Amato, senator from New York, is going to Lithuania this evening at the invitation of Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council. The senator is going without a Moscow visa and hopes that the Lithuanian Government will help him enter Lithuania.

U.S. Congressmen visited the Lithuanian legation in Washington today and met Stasys Lozoraitis, representative of Lithuania. They stated that they support the aims of Lithuania's independence.

Estonia Discusses Satellite Projects With U.S.

LD0304122590 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1800 GMT 21 Apr 90

[Summary] The first deputy minister of communications has had talks with U.S. satellite specialists. He says that two proposals have been received by the Ministry of Communications and are at present being elaborated, on a completely new satellite for telephone and television communications. The deputy minister says that if the talks prove successful, Estonia could offer some of the lines also to Latvia and Lithuania. According to the experts, he says, it will take four-six months for the lines to open, from the time that contracts are signed.

Bush Cited on Cooperation in Space Research

PM0504103990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 90 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Together to the Moon?"]

[Text] New York, 4 Apr—U.S. President G. Bush has supported the idea of cooperation with the Soviet Union in the field of the study of the solar system, including manned flights to the Moon and Mars, THE NEW YORK TIMES reports.

"Bush," the newspaper writes, "has decided that the United States will seek 'preliminary dialogue' not only with the Soviet Union but also with the European countries, Canada, Japan, and a number of other states regarding the possibility of international cooperation within the framework of the space research initiative put forward by the administration."

U.S. Employee Reportedly Met Philippine Rebels

LD0404152890 Moscow TASS in English 1503 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Manila April 4 TASS—A scandal linked with the involvement of a U.S. Air Force employee in the December military coup against President Corazon Aquino is continuing in the Philippines. After numerous denials, the United States had to admit in an official embassy statement that Harold Maglio, who met coup leaders during his visit to the Philippines in April 1989, was a U.S. Air Force employee.

Harold Maglio is a civilian employee of the Norton Air Force Base in California. He is closely linked with military supply transactions of U.S. arms manufacturers. However, the embassy denied that Maglio had anything to do with U.S. military intelligence.

The scandal broke after General Alexander Galido, who was able to win the confidence of coup leaders while on a Philippine military command mission, testified under oath that he met an American called Maglio, who offered arms to the rebels, telling them they could rely on the support of U.S. special services.

The U.S. Embassy initially denied the existence of anybody called Maglio and any such visit to the Philippines. But this only aroused fresh suspicions that the United States was trying to conceal contacts between rebels and the U.S. intelligence service. In the meantime, General Galido testified that Maglio was among the chief masterminds of the abortive coup against President Aquino.

China

Qian on Disarmament; Ties With USSR, U.S.

PM0404113790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Savenkov dispatch: "Chinese National People's Congress Session. Qian Qichen Replies to Journalists"]

[Text] Beijing—"When assessing the dynamics of disarmament in the world, China, as a rule, talks about the urgency of the contribution made by the two powers—the USSR and the United States. What can you say about the real involvement of China itself in this process? Do you intend to take any specific steps?" That was the question put by this IZVESTIYA correspondent to PRC Foreign Minister Qian Qichen at a press conference for Chinese and foreign journalists held within the framework of the Chinese National People's Congress session.

It is entirely natural, the minister replied, that disarmament problems are discussed by the United States and the USSR. Each of them has the ability to destroy the other. As Qian Qichen put it, both powers should show initiative in sharply cutting nuclear weapons and ending production, testing, and deployment of them. Following this, China will be prepared to participate in an international disarmament conference together with the other nuclear powers and other countries. The minister recalled that China has never shirked its share of responsibility. As soon as China obtained nuclear weapons the Chinese Government stated that China would never use them first under any circumstances. The minister also recalled the PRC's reduction of its armed forces a few years ago by 1 million men. Qian Qichen is convinced that the Soviet-Chinese talks on reducing the military presence in the common border region can also be considered an integral part of disarmament efforts.

Incidentally, during PRC State Council Premier Li Peng's visit to the USSR at the end of April (the specific dates are still being arranged) it is expected that agreement will be reached on cutting armed forces along the border. These should be reduced as far as possible in line with good-neighborly relations between the two countries.

The forthcoming Li Peng visit, in Qian Qichen's opinion, will advance relations between the USSR and China in various spheres, economic cooperation in particular.

Touching on the state of and prospects for Sino-U.S. relations, Qian Qichen expressed the hope that they would finally return to normal. However, the minister warned that if the U.S. Congress passes a resolution revoking China's most-favored-nation status it could only lead to the complication of Sino-U.S. relations. As for Fang Lizhi (the Chinese astrophysicist who sought asylum at the U.S. Embassy in Beijing last June), the U.S. side should take the initiative in solving this problem since, the minister believes, the U.S. Embassy is breaking international law by granting asylum to Fang Lizhi, who is the subject of an arrest warrant.

A BTA correspondent asked for clarification of China's position vis-a-vis the countries of East Europe. Qian Qichen's reply to the Bulgarian journalist was restrained: The changes in East Europe have been rapid, it would be inappropriate to comment on them without painstaking study. What is happening there is an internal matter for those countries' peoples.

PRC Defense Ministry Official Visits USSR

PM0404130190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "On Official Visit"]

[Text] Major General Song Wenzhong, chief of the PRC Defense Ministry foreign affairs bureau, arrived in the Soviet Union 2 April on an official visit.

At the airport he was met by Rear Admiral V.Zh. Khuzhokov, chief of the USSR Defense Ministry External Relations Directorate.

Major General Ning Wenyan, military, naval, and air attache to the PRC Embassy in the USSR, was among the welcoming party.

Frolov Receives New RENMIN RIBAO Head

PM0404145590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[B. Barakhta report under the rubric "PRAVDA's Guests": "Firsthand Information"]

[Text] After a 30-year break, a bureau of the CPC's central newspaper, RENMIN RIBAO, has reopened in Moscow.

Yesterday, 2 April, Comrade Zhou Xiangguang, head of the RENMIN RIBAO bureau, was received by I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of PRAVDA. I.T. Frolov talked about the progress of perestroyka in our country, preparations for the 28th party congress, and the work of PRAVDA staff to explain and propagandize the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform. It was noted that it is very important to develop good-neighborly relations.

Zhou Xiangguang conveyed a personal message to I.T. Frolov from RENMIN RIBAO Chief Editor Shao Huaze. In particular, he expressed confidence that the opening of the bureau in Moscow will help to further develop friendly relations between our newspapers and strengthen mutual understanding between the Chinese and Soviet peoples.

Chinese readers of RENMIN RIBAO will now have the opportunity to learn about life in the USSR at first hand, so to speak.

There now follows a brief interview with RENMIN RIBAO's own correspondent in Moscow.

[Barakhta] Comrade Zhou Xiangguang, have you ever visited the Soviet Union before?

[Zhou] I have only passed through. I am very glad that I have been given the honor of renewing ties between our newspapers. Your country has interested me for a long time; I studied Russian at the Shanghai Foreign Languages Institute.

[Barakhta] Our readers would be interested to learn something about the newspaper you represent.

[Zhou] RENMIN RIBAO, which means "The People's Daily," first came out under this title in June 1948. There is now a daily eight-page edition. The daily print run is considerably higher than 3 million copies.

Northeast Asia

Seoul Plays Host to Soviet Dancers, Businessmen

PM0404153990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS special correspondent I. Veksler and APN correspondent K. Deribas report specially for IZVESTIYA: "'Russian Season' in Seoul"]

[Text] A tour by the USSR Bolshoi Theater Ballet Company has begun in the South Korean capital, and business circles in the two countries have held a conference. These events reflect the dynamic development of current Soviet-South Korean relations. The flower of Seoul society gathered at the Sejong Cultural Center, where the ballet company opened with P.I. Tchaikovsky's "Swan Lake." And that was natural: This was the first time that the famous Moscow collective had traveled to the south of the Korean peninsula. There was a 10-minute ovation after the premiere. President No Tae-u, who was attending the performance, met with representatives of the Soviet collective and congratulated them on their successful debut. He made a high assessment of the guests' skills, stating that while there are no diplomatic relations between the two countries art is one of the main channels for developing bilateral ties. Soviet artistes—from Leningrad this time—will be coming here again in a week's time. I can see good prospects for strengthening our cultural cooperation, No Tae-u stressed.

Literally meters separate Sejong Cultural Center from the Lotte Hotel, where the meeting between Soviet and

South Korean businessmen was being held. Here, too, it was a question of stepping up bilateral ties.

"We are satisfied with the results of the meeting," Cho Chun-kyun, senior secretary of the South Korean-Soviet Economic Association, said in conversation with Soviet journalists. "A joint communique defining the aims and tasks for the immediate future has been adopted on its results. We have received from our colleagues an eight-page list of new proposals in the sphere of production sharing and the creation of joint ventures. In particular, it is a question of cooperation in the production of footwear, computers, and domestic equipment. It is an optimistic sign that both sides are fully resolved to implement their plans."

Undoubtedly, this will be promoted to a considerable extent by the opening up of direct communications between Moscow and Seoul. As this report is being filed, the South Korean capital is preparing to welcome the first direct Aeroflot flight.

South Korea-Romania Diplomatic Ties Established

SK0504125190 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] The Republic of Korea [ROK] and Romania have today officially established diplomatic relations. The diplomatic document concerning this was signed in Seoul between ROK Foreign Minister Choe Ho-chung and Romanian Vice Foreign Minister Mircea Mitran.

Romania is the sixth nation among the East European countries that have established diplomatic relations with the ROK.

Last year, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria established diplomatic relations with the ROK. Mongolia has also established diplomatic relations with the ROK.

President No Tae-u's administration emphasized its desire, in every way, to establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and China.

MPRP's Ochirbat Sends Thanks to Gorbachev

PM0404134190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Second Edition p 1

[Undated message from G. Ochirbat, general secretary of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee, "To Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary"]

[Text] Dear Mikhail Sergeyevich, I cordially thank you for your congratulations and good wishes in connection with my election as general secretary of the MPRP [Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party] Central Committee. I express my confidence that fraternal friendship and cooperation between the MPRP and the CPSU will continue to develop for the good of the Mongolian and Soviet peoples.

With all my heart I wish you and all Soviet Communists and workers great success in accomplishing the tasks of restructuring Soviet society and in the struggle to consolidate peace and security throughout the world.

[Signed] G. Ochirbat, general secretary of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] Central Committee

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Cambodian Army's Political Chief Interviewed

PM0404150790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Bou Thang, member of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee Politburo, deputy chairman of the State of Cambodia Council of Ministers, and chief of the Cambodian People's Army Political Directorate, by V. Vinogradov, datelined Phnom Penh-Moscow: "With Faith in Victory"—no date of interview given; first paragraph is an introduction]

[Text] A group of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA journalists toured Cambodia. While they were in Phnom Penh, Bou Thang, member of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee Politburo, deputy chairman of the State of Cambodia Council of Ministers, and chief of the Cambodian People's Army Political Directorate, kindly consented to answer questions by the newspaper's correspondent V. Vinogradov.

[Vinogradov] What is the present situation in Cambodia? How much of the country's territory has been captured by the enemy?

[Bou Thang] As you have probably realized already, our country is living constantly in conditions of semi-peace and semi-war, and fierce armed clashes periodically recur in regions along the Cambodia-Thailand border. It is there that the enemies have succeeded in establishing temporary strongholds on part of the territory they have captured. As regards elsewhere in the country's interior, any such regions are extremely insignificant and are used by the enemy only for purposes of temporary cover.

[Vinogradov] Following the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops, the Cambodian Army found itself one-on-one with the opposition forces. What difficulties do you encounter in this regard?

[Bou Thang] Soon after the full withdrawal of Vietnamese volunteers in September 1989, the enemies launched a large-scale offensive against our troops but—having regrouped our forces and recruited additional reserves—we quite swiftly managed to deliver counter-strikes and gained a series of victories.

In this context, we give much attention to ideological work. Our party's Central Committee adopted a series of

resolutions defining the defense of revolutionary gains as the paramount task at the present stage.

Naturally, the situation is still very complex in the regions where combat operations continue. I can assure you, however, that the party, the armed forces, and the people are fully determined to overcome all difficulties, working with total dedication beneath the slogan "Everything for the front, everything for the consolidation of the people's faith in our victory."

[Vinogradov] Please tell us about the Cambodian Army's latest victories and the course of combat operations.

[Bou Thang] I must tell you that the opposition had pinned major hopes on the course of combat operations during the 1989-1990 dry season. It had thoroughly worked out plans to expand and consolidate the captured regions, to set up organs of power there, and to use them as a springboard for subsequent attacks. But these schemes were not fated to materialize. Our forces inflicted crushing defeats on opposition detachments near Phnom Srok, Svai Chek, and Pang Roloem and in some other sectors of the theater of combat operations.

[Vinogradov] How do you appraise the results of the latest informal meeting in Jakarta?

[Bou Thang] That meeting demonstrated yet again that our enemies have not abandoned their perfidious schemes, nor have any intention of abandoning them in the future. The goal they seek is the collapse of our revolution, and this was reaffirmed at the Jakarta meeting, where they tried to find any possible means to distort our state's good will and our government's calls for the achievement of genuine peace in Cambodia's land. Each such meeting displays with utmost clarity the real essence of their policy which is aimed at continuation of the war and restoration of the bloody regime of genocide in Cambodia.

[Vinogradov] What are the goals presently pursued by the work of the Cambodian Armed Forces Political Directorate of which you are the head?

[Bou Thang] The activity of the Cambodian People's Army Political Directorate at present is aimed primarily at deepening the political-ideological and moral-educational work among the Armed Forces command corps and fighters, at boosting and strengthening their moral spirit in any circumstances.

Today, just as in the past, the bulk of the Political Directorate's work consists of coordinating the activity of political institutions in the Army, of political workers in the Army. It is necessary to continue implementing the policy of the party and the state in the Army, to exercise troop leadership, and to make our contribution to the cause of struggle, to the consolidation of faith in our victory.

Commentary Views U.S. Dilemma Over Khun Sa

BK0404131590 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1030 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Aleksandr Vladimirov commentary: "Why Publicize the Drug Kingpin?"]

[Text] The U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Melvin Levitsky said in Bangkok last week that a campaign will begin against heroin following U.S. successes against the cocaine network. Our station observer Aleksandr Vladimirov says it is not difficult to see that the primary objective of such a move is aimed at drug dealers in Southeast Asia, or to be more precise, the poppy producers of Myanmar [Burma].

News reports in this connection say that half of the heroin reaching the United States is from Myanmar. In December last year, a New York court indicted Khun Sa for drug trafficking. Khun Sa is notorious for trafficking large amounts of opium from the Golden Triangle where the borders of Myanmar, Laos, and Thailand converge.

Since then, U.S. official sources have been making statements about it and have been accusing in those statements the Thai and Myanmar Governments of colluding with drug traffickers. They call for the extradition of Khun Sa so that he can be tried in a U.S. court. Circumstances are such that the drug enforcement officials even suggested armed intervention with the help of the Pentagon.

Such a suggestion, particularly at a time when the Washington administration is not on good terms with the Myanmar Government, can only either threaten the Myanmar military government or psychologically pressure not only the drug kingpin but the Myanmar Government as well. However, it is understood from news reports that Melvin Levitsky has now said that Washington does not intend to take military action in Myanmar.

How then will Washington combat the threat of heroin from Southeast Asia? It is quite evident that with the absence of an action plan against drugs produced in the Golden Triangle, customs checks for heroin at U.S. entry points is ineffective. A Soviet academic on Southeast Asian affairs says that if the United States is truly serious about this, there is no other choice but to recognize the outcome of the multiparty general elections due to be held soon in Myanmar and to cooperate with Yangon [Rangoon] in combatting the threat of drugs.

So far, a move in this direction does not appear to be forthcoming. Washington has been taking approaches that oppose whatever that is done by the State Law and Order Restoration Council of Myanmar. The military government is being accused of violating human rights and of manipulating the elections to achieve the results it desires.

There have definitely been some changes in the attitude of Western news agencies covering Myanmar. The AFP

correspondent in Thailand reported on 1 April that the Myanmar authorities were helping the Wa nationals in their fight against Khun Sa's Army. Previously, these news agencies used to report that the Myanmar Government may have struck an agreement with Khun Sa in order to attack the political forces opposing them. Whatever the indications may be, the drug kingpin Khun Sa appears to be very confident of himself.

He has been issuing statements through his aides. He calls the threat of an armed incursion a bluff and the pressure applied by the United States a challenge. He said his capability to overcome these obstacles will further crown his success.

Aleksandr Vladimirov says Khun Sa is likely to continue showing his confidence until such time when those opposing him can unite among themselves.

Near East & South Asia

Tutwiler Cited on Iraqi 'Threats' to Israel

PM0504090390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA Press Service report: "Exchange of Threats"]

[Text] Iraq and Israel have exchanged serious threats in the past few days, which have sharply exacerbated tension in the Near East. On Monday, Iraqi President Saddam Husayn announced that his country possesses a chemical weapons potential equaled only by the United States and the USSR. According to him, Iraq has at its disposal a substantial supply of binary munitions—a highly effective modern chemical weapon.

"I swear to the gods, we will fire on Israel so that half of it would be devoured if it tried to take any action against Iraq," Husayn stated in a radio speech. He accused the United States, Britain, and Israel of conspiring against Iraq. Saddam Husayn categorically rejected accusations by the United States and Britain to the effect that the detonators for nuclear explosive devices seized last week by British customs officers in London's Heathrow Airport were intended for Iraq.

An Iraqi Foreign Ministry statement, published separately, states that the story of the detonators for nuclear bombs was a provocation jointly put up by U.S. and British special services with a view to discrediting Iraq and "fabricating the accusation that it is trying to obtain equipment for nuclear purposes on the U.S. market." Both Saddam Husayn's speech and the Iraqi Foreign Ministry statement point out that these accusations are part of a broad propaganda campaign against Iraq, unleashed by Britain's THE OBSERVER.

Israeli military observers believe that the Iraqi leadership's statements stem from suspicions that Israel is preparing a preventive strike against Iraq, which, in the Israelis' opinion, is preparing to acquire its own nuclear weapons. S. Husayn rejected these accusations, stating that Iraq can cause great damage to Israel with its chemical weapons alone. In 1981, Israeli aircraft attacked the "Osirak" nuclear complex, which was built near Baghdad with French assistance. According to numerous testimonies, Israel is already in possession of nuclear weapons, but military censorship in that country prohibits any publications on this subject. According to assessments made by the London International Institute of Strategic Research, there may be up to 100 nuclear warheads in the Israeli arsenal.

Israel is carefully following the actions of the Iraqi military, and acute alarm has been caused there by the current situation. Especially by reports that Iraq has stationed rockets in the west of the country, capable of reaching Tel Aviv or Damascus. This report, citing U.S. intelligence sources, was published by THE NEW YORK TIMES. According to a REUTER report, gas masks are being issued to the population, and civil defense training is being carried out, during which protection measures against a chemical attack are being rehearsed.

The Iraqi president's statement on his readiness to use chemical weapons against Israel has provoked a swift sharp reaction in the United States. Department of State spokesperson Margaret Tutwiler called it "inflammatory, irresponsible, and disgraceful." "No one should shout from the rooftops about chemical weapons in such a troubled area," M. Tutwiler said. "On the contrary, we must demand that they be eliminated." Political observers in Egypt believe, however, that reaction to the Iraqi president's statements must be restrained. "I believe that this is a preventive step connected with the fact that Iraq is afraid of any decisive actions on the part of Israel," Salamah Ahmed Salamah, a leading observer from the influential AL AHRAM, believes.

Iraqi Chemical Weapon Threat 'Inhuman'

LD0504000190 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1300 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Today we talk about the weapons of total destruction in the Middle East. What made us talk about it is the statement by Iraqi President Saddam Husayn, when he said that his country owns effective chemical weapons whose power is second only to the power of the U.S. and Soviet ones.

We have to say that Mr Nizar Hamdun, Iraqi deputy foreign minister, said one day before the president's statement that Iraq calls for banning all kinds of total destruction weapons in the Middle East. Now the deputy minster is facing the choice of either confirming that the chemical weapons are not total destruction weapons or being harassed in his job because he contradicted the words of the president.

As for President Saddam Husayn, he developed his idea and proceeded to say that if Israel launched aggression,

then the Iraqi Armed Forces will bomb half of Israel. He added that we will reply to the nuclear threat with the chemical threat.

If there was a suitable justification for President Saddam Husayn's reaction, then one would have understood it. But Iraq's threat to use the chemical weapons gives rise only to amazement in this situation. It is superfluous to stress that what constitutes a great danger in the Middle East is not the use of chemical weapons but their existence, as the majority of the inhabitants live in small areas in river valleys and oases.

I would like to recall that thousands died in Bhopal in India as a result of gas leakage from a chemical plant. Therefore, we cannot even imagine what would happen if chemical weapons were used in the Middle East.

The way Saddam Husayn himself imagines bombing half of Israel without touching half of Jordan or Lebanon, not to mention the Palestinians, is very amusing.

Some people have called chemical weapons the poor man's nuclear weapon. Chemical weapons are much cheaper in design and manufacture than the nuclear weapons. No one like the International Atomic Energy Agency obstructs the production of these weapons. There is a wide scope for obtaining the raw materials for these weapons, which make them brutal and appalling. The threat to use these weapons is inhuman and unethnical.

However, Israel hastened to answer and threatened to direct a deterrent strike on Iraq. We must say that, as far as the Israeli hawks are concerned, this situation is a gift from heaven which will give them the opportunity to promote chauvinistic hysteria in Israel, to call on the United States to give Israel additional military aid, and to cry to the whole world about the bloodthirsty Arabs.

Therefore, the result is very clear. Even if we cannot hear a single bullet in the Middle East, the situation there has deteriorated and become a lot worse.

It is difficult to say what President Saddam Husayn was aiming at when he made his statement. But he did not gain the confidence of the world or benefit the reputation of his country.

Andreyev Comments on Saddam Husayn's Remarks

NC0504112790 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from "The World Today"]

[Text] The assertion by Iraqi President Saddam Husayn that his country has effective chemical weapons and that, if Israel attacks Iraq, it can burn half of Israel have sparked off a political commotion. All the major mass media are focusing on these remarks. Our analyst Yuriy Andreyev comments on this and writes:

Politics and feelings do not mix. Machiavelli stated this five centuries ago and it has become a criterion for international relations. Today all statements on foreign policy are carefully studied and weighed. However, despite this, one cannot say that feelings do not enter into politics at all. Politicians are human beings and they do not lack human feelings. It seems that this should not be forgotten when assessing the remarks by Iraqi President Saddam Husayn.

On 2 April, Saddam Husayn said at a ceremony during which a group of Iraqi Armed Forces officers were being decorated: Even in the last year of the war with Iran, the Iraqis had chemical weapons, but they did not use them against Iran. If Israel attacks Iraq, we will burn half of Israel. Everyone should know what the limits are.

Of course, the tone of these remarks was harsh. The statement had repercussions throughout the Near and Middle East. For example, without taking details into consideration, the spokesman for the Israeli Foreign Ministry said that Israel can defend itself. Iran too reacted immediately. Ahmad 'Azizi, head of the Iranian Majles delegation who is currently in Nicosia to attend the Inter-Parliamentary Union sessions, stated that Saddam Husayn's remarks are threatening to Iran. He said: We feel that the Iraqi president could resort to chemical weapons against Iran too.

Our commentator writes: I wish to recall that, during the Iran-Iraq war, Tehran and Baghdad repeatedly accused each other of using chemical weapons. In short, Saddam Husayn's remarks have become a suitable pretext to attack the Iraqi Government. Meanwhile, the situation in the Near East is such that any thoughtless act could have unforeseen consequences. In order to prove this point, it is sufficient to look at the situation in the occupied territories of the Palestinians, Israel's aggressive policy, the extremely acute Lebanese problem, and the impasse in the Iran-Iraq peace talks. Under such conditions it may not be logical to pour oil on the fire and to fan the flames of the propaganda commotion over the Iraqi president's remarks. Meanwhile, there is no doubt that the threat to use chemical weapons cannot be the basis for the solution of the extremely complicated problems of the Near East. In the contemporary world only peace talks for finding solutions accepted by both sides and mutual self-restraint can have fruitful results.

Husayn Remarks 'Surprising'

NC0504114190 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] Our talk is on the weapons for mass annihilation in the Near East. The reason for our discussion of this topic is the statement by Iraqi President Saddam Husayn to the effect that his country possesses effective chemical weapons. From the [word indistinct], he only [words indistinct] of Soviet and American weapons.

One day before the president's remarks, the Iraqi deputy foreign minister said that Iraq supports the banning of all mass annihilation weapons in the Near East. It is not a [word indistinct]; either chemical weapons are no longer weapons for mass annihilation, or the deputy minister will be facing a [word indistinct] situation because of his remarks, which conflict with those of the president.

The president went on to say that if Israel attacks—whom?—the Iraqis will burn half of Israel's territory by using chemical weapons. Saddam Husayn said: We will reply to the nuclear threat with the chemical threat.

Of course if there were any reason for such remarks, we could still understand the Iraqi president's statement. But Iraq's threat to use the chemical weapon, coming when it did, is at best surprising. It is even necessary to say that not only the use of chemical weapons, but also their very existence in the Near East—an area where the majority of the people are concentrated in a small area, valleys, and oases—is highly dangerous. Thousands were killed by a gas leak from a civilian chemical plant in Bhopal, India. It is horrific even to think of what would happen if chemical weapons were used in the Near East. Meanwhile, how does Saddam Husayn think he can set fire to half of Israel, without harming half of Jordan or Lebanon—and we are not saying anything about the Palestinians?

Someone once described chemical weapons as the poor man's atom bomb. Actually this weapon is much cheaper to produce than the nuclear weapon. There are no obstacles such as [word indistinct] regulations in its production, and raw materials for it are obtainable. But this does not make chemical weapons less savage, and the threat to use them is no less immoral. Meanwhile, Israel did not delay answering and it, in turn, threatened that it would inflict 10 times greater blows on Iraq.

Generally speaking this situation is a gift from heaven for the Israeli hawks. It can be used as a very good pretext to fan the flames of chauvinism in the country, ask for additional military assistance from the United States, and start a commotion throughout the world about the Arabs' bloodthirsty nature.

We can see the result now. Not a single bullet has yet been fired. But in the Near East—where the situation is not very stable as it is—the tension is exacerbating. It is difficult to say what Saddam Husayn wanted to achieve. But he was unable to gain credibility for his country and trust for himself from all of this.

Smuggling, Other Problems on Iran Border Noted

LD0404193790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] You probably remember, comrades, that in January unprecedented actions occurred on the Soviet-Iranian frontier. Throughout its length engineering works were destroyed. After the tense situation persisted on the frontier. But how are things now? Our correspondent Leonid Lazarevich who recently arrived in Baku asked (Vyacheslav Ivanovich Lilin), deputy commander of the Transcaucasian Red Banner frontier district, to tell us about that.

[Begin recording] [(Lilin)] In actual fact the situation at the present time has become somewhat stabilized. The main thing is that we are on top of the situation. We can now say that we are guarding the frontier and are guarding it throughout the length of the sector entrusted to us.

[Lazarevich] Well, I shall cite the figures for one detachment. We visited it yesterday and learned that over the 24-hour period 15 violations of the state frontier were recorded. A month ago there were 300 violations on the sector of that detachment. On the one hand, that is a kind of stabilization, but I cannot help saying that on the territory of that same detachment over the whole of 1989 only 30 violations of the state frontier were registered. So, we cannot regard the situation as a favorable one.

[(Lilin)] The staff are at the moment doing their duty with very great moral and physical overstrain, although with the help of the big reserves that we possess, in the majority of sectors we are carrying out our duty reliably. But there are still sectors where a great deal of work has to be done. We are carrying out a lot of work together with local soviet bodies, with the heads of collective and state farms, and with the local population on issues of locating engineering and technical barriers, on the same site, on a new site, what kinds of barriers. Many questions arise. Perhaps barbed wire is not needed on some sectors, but is needed on others; and even the inhabitants of many areas have understood the illegality and incorrectness of their actions when they took part in the destruction of engineering and technical barriers.

[Lazarevich] Vyacheslav Ivanovich, nonetheless at the present time the frontier, both on the Soviet side and on the Iranian side, is the scene of a vast amount of smuggling.

[(Lilin)] I can tell you that we are concerned most of all not simply about individual factors, we are concerned about the organization of smuggling activity. It is not separate individuals that are becoming involved in it, but some kind of groups. We have to expect and to fear most of all of arms smuggling, drugs smuggling.

[Lazarevich] One of the reasons why considerable mass unrest flared up on the frontier was the problem of meeting relatives, and the possibility of being able to see them. Please tell me what is being done in this direction to provide people with the opportunity to have contacts with each other. This is natural, it is normal in our times.

[(Lilin)] Well, naturally it was not engineering and technical barriers that acted as obstacles. The obstruction was caused by the fact that it took such a long time to resolve the questions of simplified crossing procedures on the state frontier. That is, those methods of crossing

the frontier that we have now been introduced on the western frontier. In keeping with an accord with the Iranian side, two memoranda have been signed, one on points of simplified crossing and the other on the movement of individuals across the state frontier on private business. The reaction of the local population to this was very good, and together with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Azerbaijan, the country's Foreign Ministry and the Iranian side we have already organized a trial, if you like, an experiment on the operation of these simplified crossing points for the Navruz festival. These points of ours only operated in four places. They were operating for three days. Over those three days more than 18,000 people crossed the frontier in both directions. There were very many interesting meetings for the local residents, and searches for and discoveries of relatives. At the present time the Council of Ministers of Azerbaijan has adopted a special decision on the construction of simplified crossing points. We hope that this year, at the end of this year perhaps, these points—well, perhaps not all of them at once—should start operating. [end recording]

Andreyev Views Iran's Economy in New Year

NC0504143990 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 5 Apr 90

[Interview with Yuriy Andreyev on "On the Waves of Radio Moscow" feature]

[Text] Iran's New Year holidays are over and the state institutions and the Majles have resumed work. Our commentator, Yuriy Andreyev, comments on the problems that the New Year will bring to Iran and says:

[Begin Andreyev recording in Russian superimposed by Persian translation] Well, the holidays are over and Iranian life has returned to normal. The year 1369 [starting 21 March 1990] has finally come. It seems that this will be a relatively difficult year for the majority of Iranians. As in the past, the economy continues to cause the main problems in the country. Many of the people will probably continue to face the rationing of staple goods, daily cuts of water and electricity, the frenzied increase in the cost of living, and a high rate of inflation which is becoming more and more difficult for the government to control. As for unemployment—official figures put this at 15 percent—if Iran does not find a way to strengthen its economy as soon as possible, the unemployment rate will increase still more.

[Announcer, in studio] Have you not painted an extremely gloomy picture?

[Andreyev, in Russian, superimposed by Persian translation] This is the bitter truth. The Tehran official circles understand this well. It is not incidental that the government considers the country's economic revival as Iran's number one problem and has practically accepted that its past economic policy had no future.

The cabinet has now decided to end harsh management and the centralization of economy and to adopt the policy of expanding the private sector. Currently 80 percent of the country's industrial production is in the hands of state production units. One of the basic principles of the current cabinet's program is the sale of part of the state industries to the private sector. But it is difficult to foretell if this step will help to improve the economy. I personally think that we should not expect decisive changes in Iran's economic situation.

[Announcer, in studio] What do you think is the political outlook of the Islamic Republic?

[Andreyev, in Russian, superimposed by Persian translation] It seems that the Iran-Iraq peace agreement will assume first place in foreign policy, even though it is clear that achieving an agreement between Tehran and Baghdad is an extremely difficult task. Time and patience will be needed for this.

The alternate round of Iran-Iraq talks is to be held in late April. This round may have positive results. But it is possibly too soon to expect a final solution to the Iran-Iraq conflict.

I think that the basic stands in Tehran's foreign policy will not change, and the slogan of Neither East Nor West will continue to remain the basic principle in Iran's political stand.

[Announcer, in studio] Thank you for your commentary, Yuriy.

Niyazov Delegation Visit to PDRY Summarized

PM0404135590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 3

["On the Visit by a USSR Supreme Soviet Delegation to the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by S.A. Niyazov, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, chairman of the Turkmen SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, and first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee, was on an official visit to the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen [PDRY] 26-31 March 1990 at the invitation of the PDRY Supreme People's Council.

The delegation was received by 'A.S. al-Bid, general secretary of the Yemen Socialist Party [YSP] Central Committee, and H.A.B. al-'Attas, member of the YSP Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the PDRY Supreme People's Council Presidium.

The Soviet delegation members laid a wreath at the monument "To the Heroes of the 14 October 1963 Revolution." They toured the country and, during their tour, familiarized themselves with the historical past and present-day life of South Yemen's people and visited Soviet-Yemeni cooperation projects.

During the meetings and conversations, which proceeded in an atmosphere of friendship and comradely mutual understanding, they exchanged experience and information on the activity of the two countries' parliaments and examined questions of bilateral relations and topical international problems.

There were two rounds of talks, at which the Yemeni side was headed by S.Sh. Husayn, member of the Supreme People's Council Presidium, member of the YSP Central Committee, and first secretary of the Yemeni Socialist Youth League Central Committee. The members of the Supreme People's Council described the work currently being done in Democratic Yemen to implement a comprehensive political and economic reform and to democratize social life.

They described in detail the specific features of the current important stage in the unification process between the PDRY and the YAR [Yemen Arab Republic], a process aimed at implementing the Yemeni people's patriotic aspirations. Special attention was given to the role assigned to the supreme organ of legislative power in light of measures to approve the single state's draft constitution.

The Soviet parliamentarians expressed support for the constructive development of dialogue and the unionist steps intended to promote the Yemeni people's progress and prosperity and to strengthen peace and stability on the Arabian Peninsula. Viewing in this context the process in the direction of creating a united Yemeni state, they believe that the question of specific forms, ways, and time schedules for the implementation of unity is an internal and sovereign affair of the Yemenis themselves.

The Soviet delegation described in detail the main components of the present stage of perestroyka in the USSR and the role played by soviets of people's deputies at different levels to attain a qualitatively new state of Soviet society, to develop the processes of democratization of state and social life, and to create a new structure of organs of power and management. In this context emphasis was placed on the crucial importance of the Third Extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies which adopted the decision to introduce presidential rule, and of the just-concluded campaign for elections of republic and local organs of power.

During the discussion of foreign policy questions the two countries' parliamentarians concluded that positive developments in international affairs offer convincing proof of the increasingly tangible influence exerted by the new political thinking on the improvement of the international climate and the strengthening of universal peace and security.

Both sides noted with gratification that these changes have created conditions for qualitatively new, peaceful, and predictable international development on the basis of the primacy of universal human values.

The parliamentarians from Democratic Yemen declared their support for the USSR's foreign policy line of ending the arms race, reducing and eliminating nuclear arsenals, and creating a nuclear-free and nonviolent world. The Soviet delegation members, in their turn, highly appraised the PDRY's stance on topical international problems.

The sides gave special attention to the situation in the Near East, which creates a serious threat to peace and international security. The Soviet and Yemeni parliamentarians affirmed their solidarity with the Palestinian people's intifadah [uprising] and noted its staunchness in the face of the Israeli repressive machine. They emphasized the importance of the speediest achievement of an all-embracing and just settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the convening of an international conference on the Near East with the participation of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. It was noted, moreover, that the PLO's participation as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people is necessary at all stages of the peace process. There was a high appraisal of the Soviet Union's decision to upgrade [preobrazovat] the PLO Mission in Moscow to an Embassy of the State of Palestine in recognition of this organization's important role and position in the Near East settlement and in international affairs.

The sides expressed their conviction that the development of parliamentary ties accords with the interests of the peoples of both friendly countries and with the consolidation of positive trends in world politics. The Soviet and South Yemeni legislators advocated further strengthening of ties between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the PDRY Supreme People's Council as an important component of interstate relations. They agreed to further coordinate the specific avenues and forms of bilateral cooperation with due consideration for the changes occurring in both countries.

The meetings held by the USSR's representatives on Yemeni soil proceeded in a warm and friendly atmosphere. The Soviet delegation invited the PDRY Supreme People's Council to send a delegation on an official visit to the Soviet Union. The invitation was gratefully accepted. The specific timing of the visit will be agreed on later.

Lukyanov Pays Visit to Indian Parliament

LD0404141290 Moscow TASS in English 1336 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] New Delhi April 4 TASS—"We are following attentively the changes that are occurring in your country and we are deeply influenced by the policy of glasnost and perestroyka," Indian House of the People Speaker Rabi Ray said during a meeting with USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov, who is now paying an official visit to India at the invitation of the Indian leadership.

Anatoliy Lukyanov and his party familiarised themselves today with the work of the Indian parliament. Welcoming the Soviet guests, Ray expressed the hope that his visit would help deepen parliamentary contacts between the two countries, promote friendly relations between India and the Soviet Union. Rabi Ray stressed that the Indian parliament was profoundly impressed by President Gorbachev's activities and that it regarded him as the man of our century.

Describing the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Lukyanov said its very first resolutions confirmed the Soviet parliament's adherence to the policy of promoting friendly Soviet-Indian relations. "It goes without saying", he said, "that all this is based on the treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation signed by the USSR and India in 1971 and on the historic New Delhi declaration on the principles of a nuclear-weapons free and non-violent world, which is of tremendous political, philosophical and international significance. The head of the Soviet parliament expressed the conviction that his meetings would allow the sides to fruitfully exchange experience on the most diverse problems.

The visit to the Indian parliament was rounded off by a tour of the upper house's Assembly Hall and the Hall for Joint Meetings of the two houses. The guests also were shown around the parliamentary library.

In the afternoon the Soviet parliamentary delegation will visit the parliament's museum and archive. Lukyanov will have a talk with Indian parliament members.

Further on Visit

LD0504064490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1640 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Delhi, 4 Apr (TASS)—The first day of the official visit to India by A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, at the invitation of the country's leadership, was devoted to familiarization with the activity of the Indian Parliament and a discussion of issues of further development of interparliamentary contacts and the entire complex of bilateral Soviet-Indian relations.

The business part of the visit began with a visit to Parliament, the Republic's supreme legislative body comprising two chambers: upper—the Council of States, and lower—the House of the People. But before that, according to tradition, A.I. Lukyanov visited the Raj Ghat memorial. Here a wreath was laid at the site of the cremation of Mahatma Gandhi, leader of India's people's liberation movement. The ribbon carried the inscription: "To Mahatma Gandhi—founder of free India, father of the Indian nation." A.I. Lukyanov made an entry in the visitors' book and planted a tree—an evergreen magnolia—in the memorial park. [passage omitted]

A.I. Lukyanov and the USSR people's deputies that arrived with him—Yu.A. Platonov, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Building and Architecture and first secretary of the Board of the USSR Union of Architects; Yu.V. Skokov, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Economic Reform and director-general of the Kvant Scientific-Production Association; V.I. Pokrovskiy, president of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences; and Yu.M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, attended a sitting of the session of the Parliament's House of the People that is currently taking place. [passage omitted]

Afghan Reconciliation Policy Continues

PM0504143190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 90 Second Edition p4

[Veniamin Shurygin "Viewpoint": "Afghanistan: Reconciliation and Freedom of Choice"]

[Text] The trend toward a political solution of armed conflicts that has appeared in international life in recent years has ground to a halt in Afghanistan. It has ground to a halt despite the fact that it was in Afghanistan that it was given a powerful boost. I am referring to the Geneva agreements, which have provided the impetus for the resolution of regional conflicts in various parts of the world. But reports are still coming out of Kabul about missile attacks on the Afghan capital and bitter fighting near Khowst, as well as clashes outside Jalalabad and Qandahar and in other regions of the country. The bloodshed goes on.

Moreover, attempts are being made to undermine from within the forces which are working consistently and purposefully for national reconciliation and a political solution to the Afghan conflict. I am referring to the recent attempt at a coup d'etat made by the former defense minister, General Tanay, and his supporters. There is no doubt that the putsch did great military, political, and moral damage to the Afghan Government and ruling party. It is not hard to imagine what the defection to the enemy side by top-ranking military officials means for the armed forces' defense capability. Many of the insurgents were members of the central People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan [PDPA] leadership and had influence among certain party circles. Great material damage has also been done. Healthy forces have stood their ground, however. And, finally, every cloud has a silver lining: They have been purged of the influential "fifth column" and have drawn the relevant conclusions for themselves.

I believe it would not be a bad idea if the appropriate lessons were also learned from this by those who so stubbornly stick to what is essentially an anti-Afghan stand by doing their utmost to delay peace coming to the land of Afghanistan. One of these lessons is obvious: The course of events in and around Afghanistan, particularly over the past year, shows that the Afghan Government cannot be addressed in the language of ultimatums. In any event, and immovable property is to be handed over:

land, enterprises, trading centers and stores, money and foreign currency, shares and securities.

It is planned to create a new organization—the Afghan Peace Front—to unite all patriotic national forces on the basis of the existing National Front. Its draft platform envisages involving all patriotic national forces both within the country and temporarily outside the country in building a peaceful, independent, prospering Afghanistan.

The recent PDPA Central Committee plenum adopted a decision on convening a second congress, which will discuss questions connected with the party's complete renewal in the context of taking further steps to abandon its monopoly on power and establishing new relations with other parties and state and social organizations.

Afghanistan Peace Front Program Discussed

NC0404142790 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1550 GMT 3 Apr 90

[Vladimir Paskov commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners, the special committee charged with compiling the documents of the Afghanistan Peace Front has held a session in Kabul. The draft of the Peace Front's program was sent to all socio-political figures and organizations as well as prominent personalities within Afghanistan and abroad. It was suggested that the recepients should submit their views on the program and join this organization.

The Afghan leadership continues to seek to set up a broad-based interim government and attract all strata of society to the national reconciliation policy. The Afghanistan Peace Front can play a special role in this regard. This organization differs from the present National Front and the leftist unions in that all individuals who favor the restoration of peace in the country will have the opportunity to participate in its activities regardless of their political affiliations.

One of the tasks of the new organization is to prepare and convene free and direct parliamentary elections. The parliament to be elected by secret ballot will form a broad-based government. The Afghan leadership has announced its willingness to accept the results of the elections which should be held under international supervision.

The draft of the program states that the Peace Front will seek to strengthen an interim multiparty system and guarantee freedom of expression as well as other political freedoms such as that of assembly mentioned in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The status of the Peace Front in the country's political system is still not clear, but should be clarified at the peace congress scheduled to be held in July at which the Peace Front will be officially established. All organizations, factions, and movements and social, political, and religious figures including those that are living abroad have been invited to attend the congress.

The number of Afghans who realize that none of the present political forces is capable of ending the war by itself is increasing daily. This is shown by the growing number of opposition military commanders who are joining the national reconciliation program.

There is no doubt that under such circumstances the proposal of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan for establishing a broad-based government by means of free and comprehensive elections will have a greater chance of success.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Shevardnadze's Tour of African Countries Assessed

PM0404141590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Special correspondent M. Yusin dispatch: "New View of Africa"]

[Text] Luanda-Lusaka-Windhoek-Maputo-Harare-Dar es Salaam-Lagos-Moscow—IZVESTIYA's diplomatic correspondent accompanied E.A. Shevardnadze on his tour of seven African countries which ended at the start of this week.

The visit schedule was very hectic. Seven countries in nine days. Journalists worked out that the flights alone had taken more than one and a half days. It turned out that the arithmetic was of interest to the minister himself. At the last press conference—held in the Nigerian capital of Lagos a few hours before the flight back to Moscow—E.A. Shevardnadze reported that the "Africa tour" had covered 27,000 km. This was the first-ever trip to tropical Africa by the Soviet diplomatic chief.

Why was the tour staged at this particular time? The choice of the second half of March was brought about by a specific date. On 21 March Namibia, the last colony on the African continent, ceremonially proclaimed its independence. Heads of state and government and foreign ministers from dozens of countries went to Windhoek to take part in the ceremony and, naturally, the Soviet Union could not stand aside.

Certain African newspapers featured the following idea: The trip was undertaken exclusively because of Namibia, the minister visited the other countries "en route," as it were. It is hard to agree with that claim. There was an urgent need for this tour. Even if Namibian independence had not been proclaimed the trip would still have taken place. Perhaps slightly later.

The fact is that there has been a definite pause in our dialogue with the African countries in recent years. Visits to Moscow by ranking guests from the "dark continent" have become rare. And the people who have

come have mainly been our traditional allies and clients—the leaders of Ethiopia, Angola, and Mozambique. Contacts with other states have been suspended. More and more frequently alarming voices have been heard in Africa's capitals saying that the USSR is turning away from them, that it has no more time for Africa, that it is completely engrossed in its own internal problems and relations with the West. There has been a kind of crisis of confidence. This crisis needed to be eliminated...

Talking during the tour with Foreign Ministry staffers who deal with Africa, I invariably asked them why our Africa policy has become deadlocked to a certain extent, what was the main mistake in it? Almost all the people with whom I talked agreed that the main mistake was the universal ideologization of our relations. Soviet diplomats strove at all costs to turn Africa into a "socialist-oriented continent." The socialist choice was imposed on everyone—without consideration for historical, economic, or national features. And generous aid flowed as a mark of gratitude.

The economic model espoused by socialist-oriented African countries has turned out to be bankrupt almost everywhere. And if states were still managing to keep their heads above water somehow, it was largely thanks to Soviet injections into their collapsing economies. The dozen "friendly states which made the socialist choice" turned into a heavy burden on our declining budget. Perestroyka has placed a revision of relations with Africa on the agenda. We could no longer allow ourselves to base those relations on free aid. The public was asking more and more persistently: Can we act as a charity, given our poverty?

In the Brezhnev years this question was not asked. When millions of rubles were allocated to support the latest "anti-imperialist" state, this was seen in the country as a natural phenomenon. But when a friendly regime suddenly demonstrated its dictatorial essence to the entire world or sharply broke off relations with the Soviet Union there was nobody to demand the thoughtlessly wasted money from. The trend now is different. In newspapers, on television, and in the Supreme Soviet voices can be heard demanding that the "frittering away of the people's resources" to Third World countries be stopped. When people worked out how much Africa had cost us over the past decades, the picture was depressing. The debts of Angola alone in the 15 years since it proclaimed its independence stook at almost 3 billion rubles. Other states' debts did not amount to such an astronomical sum, but they were also very significant...

One of the aims of Shevardnadze's Africa tour was to explain to our African partners why the need had arisen to change our policy toward Africa and what the essence of the new approach was. It was not a question of ending cooperation but merely of ensuring that this cooperation finally became advantageous to the Soviet Union as well and ceased being "one-way traffic."

Economic aspects were touched upon in almost every conversation. True to its concept that Soviet foreign policy should stop being expenditure-based, the minister tried to discuss ways in which our African partners could repay us at least some of their debts. In the official reports this aspect of the talks was not always widely reflected, but it was present nonetheless. And the Soviet side attached great importance to it. It is hard to say how African leaders approached this delicate question, but verbally they have been stating their complete understanding for the Soviet position.

Discussions about economic cooperation with representatives of the relatively developed countries (such as Nigeria) have been meaningful and rich in content. There are good prospects in Tanzania, too—opportunities have emerged to repay some of the debt.

The leaders of certain states (Angola and Mozambique, for instance) have asked to reschedule payments, bearing in mind their catastrophic economic position compounded by continuing civil war. At the same time, the minister was assured that as soon as hostilities end and the economy starts reviving, the question of debt payments to the Soviet Union will be examined without fail.

Now to the political side of the visit. In nine days E.A. Shevardnadze met with 26 presidents, prime ministers, and heads of diplomatic departments. The busiest stage of the trip was Namibia. The Soviet minister's talks with J. Baker and H.-D. Genscher, which our newspaper has already reported, attracted particular attention from the 2,000 journalists who were in Windhoek during those festive days. But, nonetheless, the main sensation was the talk with South African President Frederik de Klerk.

Many people in the African world were cautious about this meeting. Doesn't it show that the USSR is prepared to relax its pressure on the country which is still implementing the apartheid policy? I think there are no grounds for those fears. The Windhoek meeting was possible precisely because the South African leadership has started dismantling apartheid, openly proclaiming its aim to be the rejection of the racial segregation system within a few years.

"I believe that President De Klerk is an honest man and really believes what he says." Those words were said at a meeting with Shevardnadze, again in Windhoek, by none other than Nelson Mandela, vice president of the African National Congress, who spent 27 years in South African jails. If even such an uncompromising opponent of apartheid as Mandela is publicly stating his confidence in the current South African leader, there can hardly be any doubt that major, in-depth changes are happening in Pretoria.

Soviet diplomacy, which has recently been reacting in a sensitive and timely manner to the processes taking place in the world, has quickly picked up on this trend. The first harbinger of change was last year's semisecret meeting between Deputy Foreign Minister A.L. Adamishin and former South African President Pieter

Botha. (Reports on these contacts appeared at the time only in the Western press). And now the dialogue has been continued in Windhoek.

The talks continued more than 90 minutes instead of the one hour allocated by protocol. Shevardnadze's comment on the results of the talks was laconic: "It was a very necessary meeting." Journalists managed to learn certain interesting details of the talks, which did not make their way into the short TASS report. Thus, for instance: De Klerk told the Soviet minister that the policy being pursued by the South African Government is being called Pretoria-stroyka, and the president himself is being compared to Gorbachev. "It's said I even look like him—don't you think so, Mr. Minister?" the president asked with a smile. Then, quickly getting serious, he talked for a long time about the difficulties that face him every day, the dogged resistance from the right (from white conservatives), and the constant pressure from the left (impatient black radicals). De Klerk showed that the evolutionary process cannot be completed at one go—it will require a definite transitional period, several years. The president reaffirmed yet again that the government's ultimate aim is to put an end to apartheid.

Both sides agreed that contacts need to be continued. But in what way? Is it likely that in the near future if not embassies, then at least consulates or consular groups (the Soviet-Israeli option) or trade missions (as in Seoul) will soon open in Pretoria and Moscow? At an improvised press conference held immediately after the talks ended, De Klerk avoided discussing the subject. As for Shevardnadze, he touched on Soviet-South African relations in a discussion with journalists in the plane en route from Nigeria to Moscow. The minister recalled the Soviet position: In order for diplomatic relations to be established Pretoria must reject apartheid. Until this has happened there is nothing to discuss. As for contacts at a different level, they should be maintained. You get the impression that certain specific plans already exist. But so far neither side is in a hurry to publicize them. That is understandable—it is a highly delicate matter.

Touching on his personal impressions of the meeting with De Klerk, the minister said that he agreed with Mandela's opinion about the South African president's sincerity. "I want to assure you that De Klerk's actions match his words, and his aim is the dismantling of apartheid," Shevardnadze said.

One other important aspect of the South Africa problem: What to do about economic sanctions? Should they be relaxed so as to stimulate further reform activity by De Klerk and give him a trump card in his fight with the conservatives? (A number of Western countries, above all, Britain, support this position). Or should economic pressure be continued and even stepped up until apartheid is a thing of the past? (This approach is defended by most African states, as well as a number of European states—above all, Sweden). I understand from talks with Foreign Ministry staffers that the Soviet Union is inclined toward the second option—as long as apartheid exists sanctions must be maintained.

Political contacts are another matter. Their usefulness is indisputable. And not only in settling the situation in South Africa itself but for ending conflicts in neighboring states. Whether we like it or not, the Angola and Mozambique problems cannot be solved without Pretoria. Incidentally, Luanda and Maputo understand that perfectly well. In the talks with Shevardnadze the leaders of Angola and Mozambique welcomed South Africa's participation in the peace process.

The need to rapidly settle regional conflicts in Africa is becoming more and more obvious. And Washington, Moscow, and Pretoria are in solidarity on that question. Everyone suffers from the wars that are besetting Angola and Mozambique. The constant seat of tension in these countries destabilizes the situation in the whole region. War has been a very severe burden for the populations of these two long-suffering states. Angola, for instance, has spent more than $20 billion on military operations. The results have not been long in coming. A country which was considered the pearl of Africa under the Portuguese is in a poverty-stricken state. Economic life has come to a standstill, communications between the cities and the countryside have been lost... Yet, according to specialist assessments, Angola is richer than both Zaire and Namibia in terms of its natural resources. Before independence was declared it supplied the mother country with 400,000 tonnes of grain a year. Now the country is starving. The situation is similar (although not as critical) in Mozambique.

Both countries' governments are calling on the opposition forces to begin a dialogue. So far it is hard to say whether these initiatives will meet with a response. It will probably still take a long time, exhaustive talks, and mutual compromises. And yet there are grounds for optimism—such as the settlement of the conflict in neighboring Namibia and the example of distant Nicaragua, whose experience could be wholly utilized on African soil as well. Through its foreign minister the Soviet Union reaffirmed its adherence to solving all disputes peacefully around the negotiating table. The Luanda and Maputo talks showed that there are good prospects for this...

And in conclusion, one other point, which should not be forgotten—the evolution of Soviet-U.S. relations as applied to Africa. As E.A. Shevardnadze noted in discussion with journalists on board the aircraft, in the African region we and the Americans are "successfully moving away from competition toward cooperation." And this cooperation is not to the detriment of the African states—on the contrary, it is in their interests. The removal of the Namibia problem, which had seemed insoluble for dozens of years, was a most graphic reaffirmation of the effectiveness of such cooperation. Judging by the statements made by African officials, during his "tropical marathon" Shevardnadze managed

to convince his interlocutors that Soviet-U.S. rapprochement poses no threat to Africa.

East Europe

Explosion Delays Withdrawing USSR Troop Train

LD0404154690 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1330 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] The Ministry of National Defense has reported that this morning the rail transportation of withdrawing Soviet troops from our territory was delayed because of an explosion of an unidentified object which was thrown out of a moving train. No one was injured. In order that the incident could be investigated the transportation was stopped in the Kysak train station. The investigation is being carried out by the military district prosecutor general in Presov in cooperation with public security, the armed protection of railways' administration, organs of military transportation, and representatives of the Soviet Army.

Czechoslovak Parties Prepare for Summer Poll

PM0504090790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Preparations for Elections in Czechoslovakia"]

[Text] Prague, 2 Apr—The political forces in Czechoslovakia have embarked on preparations for the upcoming summer elections. "Civic Forum" adopted the final text of its election program at an assembly Saturday [31 March]. Addressing the assembly Jan Urban, head of the "Civic Forum" coordination center, emphasized that the Forum must approach the elections as a united force. He announced that an agreement had been reached with the "Public Against Violence" movement and said that the departure of Social Democrats and Christian Democrats from the Forum and the exclusion of their candidates from the joint list would be premature, although it is to be expected.

The constituent congress of the Czech and Moravian Communist Party, which has a membership of 700,000 at the moment, has also drawn up its candidates. The special feature of the Communists' stance is that they are prepared to include representatives of other left-wing forces on the candidate lists. During the election campaign the party favors a contest of serious arguments and an open, valid debate on the future development of our society, Ladislav Adamec, chairman of the Czechoslovak Communist Party emphasized at the congress.

Another important political force in the country is the Czechoslovak Agrarian Party. According to predictions, it can count on the votes of some 80,000-130,000 voters. As a coalition of the movements of the Czech and Slovak countryside, the Czechoslovak Agrarian Party demands reparations for the damage inflicted on farmers as a result of the distortions of collectivization.

The Free Farmers' Party, whose constituent congress has just been held, has decided that because of its small membership (6,000) it will not stand independently but will reinforce the right-center bloc by associating with the Czechoslovak People's Party, Christian Democratic Party, and Republican Party.

The Beer Lovers' Party does not want to lag behind the others either. In reply to ironical remarks about the unserious nature of this movement its first secretary has declared: We must prepare for the elections and put up our own candidates. The party now has 4,000 members and at least 10,000 sympathizers.

The preparations for the elections are gathering momentum. However, it is clear right now that the upcoming battle will not be easy. It seems that the demarcation of the positions of the political forces in the Czechoslovak Federal Republic will make passions run even higher.

Czechoslovak Official on Status of INF Missiles

PM0404153190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent L. Kornilov dispatch: "The Republic Has a New Name"]

[Excerpts] Prague—Henceforth, the Czechoslovak state is called the Czechoslovak Federative Republic (in Czech) and the Czecho-Slovak Federative Republic (in Slovak). Both names have absolutely equal value. [passage omitted]

It has also been reported that deputies at the Federal Assembly session which has been held during the past few days were informed that 4,969 Soviet servicemen, 338 tanks, 1,427 armored vehicles, and 91 guns were withdrawn from Czechoslovakia by 25 March. Approximately one-third of all Soviet troops stationed in the country will be withdrawn by 31 May.

Parliament has formed a commission to supervise this process. At this session the chambers annulled the decision of the CSSR National Assembly adopted 18 October 1968 in which the agreement on the conditions of the temporary presence of Soviet forces on Czechoslovak territory was approved.

In connection with a statement published by the U.S. State Department that the Soviet Union transferred missiles to Czechoslovakia that were prohibited in the well-known Soviet-U.S. Agreement on Eliminating Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, CSSR Foreign Ministry spokesman L. Dobrovsky told the CTK agency that less than 10 missiles known as SS-23's, with conventional warheads and a radius of action of 400 km, are located on Czechoslovak territory.

The missiles were sited in Czechoslovakia in 1985, that is two years before the above-mentioned agreement was concluded. The Czechoslovak Army has no other missiles of similar or greater range. The Czechoslovak

Foreign Ministry is presenting this information because the above-mentioned missiles are Czechoslovak property and are not subject to the operation of the Soviet-U.S. agreement, the report points out. The CSSR Foreign Ministry expresses surprise about the inaccuracies contained in the statement made by the State Department spokesman.

CPCZ Analysis of 1968, Developments Published

PM0404130990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 90 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Theses of CPCZ Central Committee Commission Report on the Events of 1968-1969"]

[Text] Prague, 29—RUDE PRAVO has published the theses of a report by a CPCZ [Czechoslovak Communist Party] commission which gives an objective evaluation of the events of 1968-1969 and Czechoslovakia's subsequent development. This commission was formed at the extraordinary CPCZ congress in December last year. It was faced with the task of presenting the 18th CPCZ Congress with a full report analyzing the events in the recent history of the party and society.

The need to discuss the path taken by the CPCZ in its history of nearly 70 years, particularly since 1968, was caused by the desire not just to restore historical truth but also to reject the political concepts—and those who believed in them—that caused great damage to the life of the country and profoundly discredited socialist ideals in Czechoslovakia, the document notes.

The political events of 1968 were not just a clash between revolution and counterrevolution, socialism and capitalism, and Marxism and revisionism. This was an attempt by democratic forces within the party to overcome Stalinist deformations, to renew socialism, and to develop it creatively in the interests of the Czechoslovak people. It was a struggle between sectarian-dogmatic approaches and creative approaches to Marxism and socialism.

The CPCZ Central Committee January plenum of 1968 (the election of A. Dubcek as first secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee) opened up scope for reforms with a view to the elimination of Stalinist models of socialism and the creation of a democratic socialist society. The new party leadership's reformative policy enjoyed the support of the majority of the people and many communist parties worldwide. However, representatives of the USSR, GDR, Polish, Hungarian, and Bulgarian communist and workers parties began to criticize it more actively. Their opinion was shared by the sectarian-dogmatic grouping in the CPCZ Central Committee, which put forward the possibility of bringing troops from these countries into Czechoslovakia, and made ready for this.

Bringing troops from five Warsaw Pact countries into Czechoslovakia in August 1968, the report then stresses, affected the correlation of forces within the party to the advantage of those who rejected the movement for the renewal of socialism. After April 1969, when G. Husak was elected leader of the CPCZ, principles of the Stalinist model of socialism were revived, a large-scale purge in the CPCZ deprived the party of most of its intellectual potential and hundreds of thousands of honest and selfless people, and some nonparty people also suffered.

The policy based on the triumph of dogmatic-sectarian policy and total dependence on Brezhnevian hegemonism during the 1970's, and particularly the 1980's, was deeply opposed to society's needs, and the trends of European and world development. As a result, stagnation occurred in the economy, the population's dissatisfaction grew, and opposition movements and sentiments appeared, primarily involving the intelligentsia and the younger generation.

The beginning of perestroyka in the USSR evoked great hopes in the party and society, the document points out. But no fundamental changes were made in CPCZ policy either at the 17th CPCZ Congress or at the seventh plenum of the CPCZ Central Committee in 1987, when changes were made in the party leadership. The party leadership, whose core was formed after April 1969, felt threatened by the Soviet policy of perestroyka and renewal of socialism. It defended itself against reevaluating the events of August 1968 and began to stress the specific path of Czechoslovakia's development. Verbal support for perestroyka, and the economic reform and democratization that were proclaimed, prolonged the CPCZ's monopolistic stance and the absolute power of its narrow circle of leading representatives.

This policy turned out to be opposed to the urgent demands of Czechoslovakia's further development. It pushed most of society to the opposition's side, against the CPCZ and socialism. As a result of these mistakes, it was not the CPCZ that was the main force of sociopolitical movement inspired by Soviet perestroyka and M.S. Gorbachev's policy, but civil initiatives, which, in November of last year, started a new historical phase in our country.

At present, the CPCZ is experiencing a phase of fundamental changes and is gradually turning into a modern left-wing party which aims to become a component of our new democratic political system, the commission's material notes.

Gremitskikh Assails Polish-Lithuanian Communique

LD0404185490 Warsaw PAP in English 1700 GMT 4 Apr 90

[By PAP correspondent Jerzy Malczyk]

[Text] Moscow, April 4—Spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry Yuriy Gremitskikh termed the Polish-Lithuanian communique, adopted at the end of the recent visit to Lithuania by chairman of the citizen's parliamentary committee Bronislaw Geremek, interference in the Soviet Union's internal affairs.

Summing up results of his one-day visit to Vilnius, the chairman of the citizen's parliamentary club in the Polish Sejm said about the adoption of the "Polish-Lithuanian communique" in which actually an attempt to develop relations with Lithuania as with a separate state was made. [sentence as received]

We size up actions of this kind on part of the official representative of the Republic of Poland as nothing but interference in the Soviet Union's internal affairs, the Soviet spokesman said, and we assume that the Polish side will take this into account, he said.

We try to solve questions concerning Lithuania through dialogue and within the framework of the Soviet constitution. In this context, all inconsiderate declarations or actions from the outside can only cause additional complications.

Polish Newsmen Meet With PRAVDA's Frolov

PM0404131990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Apr 90 Second Edition p 4

[M. Tretyakov report: "Plans of the Polish Newspaper TRYBUNA"]

[Text] A delegation of the Polish newspaper TRYBUNA has visited Moscow at the invitation of the PRAVDA Editorial Board. The delegation comprised Marek Siwiec, member of the Central Executive Committee of the SdRP [Social Democracy of the Polish Republic] and TRYBUNA chief editor, and Czeslaw Rowinski, his first deputy.

The Polish delegation visited the PRAVDA editorial office and met with members of the newspaper's editorial board.

I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and PRAVDA chief editor, had talks with the Polish guests. During the talks I.T. Frolov spoke about the large-scale changes in our country, about PRAVDA's role in preparing for the 28th CPSU Congress, and about measures to improve the editorial board's work. M. Siwiec reported on the political situation in Poland and on the difficult position of TRYBUNA and of representatives of left-wing forces in the republic, which are operating under conditions of strong pressure from right-wing groupings.

Questions of broadening and deepening forms of cooperation, including plans to implement joint measures, to exchange journalists of the two newspapers, and to seek new approaches and contacts in further improving the mechanism of cooperation, were discussed during the meeting at the PRAVDA editorial office.

At the end of the talks PRAVDA's correspondent asked M. Siwiec to answer three questions.

[Correspondent] Could you say a few words about TRYBUNA and the areas of its work?

[Siwiec] It is the new newspaper of the party of Polish left-wing forces—the SdRP. It began appearing two months ago. It has a weekday print run of 250,000 copies, and more than 400,000 on Saturdays. Our newspaper is not an organ of the party but operates alongside it. TRYBUNA is now virtually the only significant opposition newspaper in Poland, but at the same time we are not waging a struggle against the government but are endeavoring to show readers what "Solidarity" and the cabinet of ministers are doing. The newspaper also plays a big organizing role in shaping the SdRP. In this TRYBUNA expresses the interests of all left-wing forces in the republic.

[Correspondent] What position does the SdRP hold in Poland's political arena?

[Siwiec] The fundamental difference between the SdRP and the PZPR [Polish United Workers Party] is that it is one of many parties operating in the republic today. The SdRP is not a communist party, and it identifies above all with European social democratic parties. The SdRP now has more than 50,000 members. The party's membership is growing slowly because representatives of left-wing forces, including former PZPR members, are being persecuted in Poland today. I believe that its ranks will begin growing when we succeed in turning the situation around and people no longer fear the consequences of belonging to the party. The chief point is that the SdRP will participate in the local council elections in May, whose results will determine the party's real place in Poland's political arena and the support that it enjoys within society.

[Correspondent] What could you say about the results of this visit?

[Siwiec] I appreciate highly the results of my visit to the PRAVDA editorial office. It has been a step toward establishing cooperation between a new newspaper, which is TRYBUNA, and PRAVDA, which is making changes to its activities. I believe that this creates fundamentally new opportunities for mutual support in both the political and the material spheres.

East Germans Feel 'Deceived' Over Mark Exchange

PM0404155190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Apr 90 Second Edition p6

[Own correspondent M. Podklyuchnikov dispatch: "Deception Brought to Light"]

[Text] Berlin, 2 Apr—The GDR CDU [Christian Democratic Union] Board is receiving numerous telephone calls from angry people who feel deceived. They have every reason to feel deceived.

Television, radio, and the press have relayed an item of news across the republic concerning a vitally important matter: the ratio under which GDR marks will be

exchanged for FRG marks with the conclusion of monetary and economic union between the two German states.

During the election campaign, when GDR citizens had to decide who would represent them in the People's Chamber, the question of future financial and economic union with the FRG occupied a prominent place. Many newspapers described the elections as "the first free elections" in the country's history. When the results were known, they were also christened "the last free elections." The upper hand was gained by the right-wing party bloc, "Alliance for Germany," which has proclaimed earliest possible unification between the FRG and the GDR as its objective.

Assessing the election results, however, many GDR publicists have questioned whether the elections could be called "free" at all. FRG political forces blatantly interfered in their preparation, using all the might of their propaganda apparatus. Rallies in the GDR were frequently addressed by Chancellor H. Kohl. Putting powerful psychological pressure on GDR citizens, West German politicians primarily promised voters "prosperity," which would follow immediately after the conclusion of financial and economic union with the FRG. A one-to-one exchange rate figured among the election promises made in the West.

The pressure worked. A considerable proportion of the electorate believed in the promised exchange rate and gave their votes to those who spoke about it as a foregone conclusion. So the latest news from the West has come like a cold shower for many people here: The Central Council of the Federal Bank has reached the conclusion that the exchange rate must be two to one (only savings bank deposits of up to 2,000 marks in a single account may be exchanged on a one to one basis). This means a nominal halving of wages, grants, and pensions.

In an interview with the newspaper BILD, H. Modrow, acting head of the GDR Government, pointed to the contradiction between the Federal Bank proposal and what was said by Chancellor H. Kohl during the election struggle.

Since the border between the GDR and the FRG was opened, millions of the republic's citizens have visited the West and become acquainted with the price structure that exists there. One newspaper summed it up like this: "Life's essentials are inexpensive in our country and dearer in the FRG. Luxury items are expensive in our country and cheaper there." In other words, bread, butter, meat, and vegetables are more costly in the FRG. So the people who are going to receive half what they do now—albeit in hard currency—can see that it is not prosperity that awaits them but the need to struggle to make ends meet.

The newspaper NEUES DEUTSCHLAND polled citizens in Berlin's Alexander Platz. Hans Schakowski, a driver from Schwedt, said: "Many chose the CDU for the sake of the Western mark. This is the situation in which they have landed as a result. Unfortunately, we have landed in it with them. I will not be able to live on 500 marks a month." Fitter Jurgen Mueller has come to this conclusion: "We should note the real worth of the election promises made by H. Kohl's party." Worker Adelheid Bernhard had this to say: "I would get 350 marks. You cannot feed a family on that. I feel terrible just thinking about it."

Lothar de Maiziere, chairman of the GDR CDU, said at a press conference in Berlin that the exchange rate proposed by the FRG has not been discussed with the GDR. The CDU has always believed and still believes that the exchange rate should be one to one.

Martin Kirchner, general secretary of the same party, said that the Federal Bank proposal is "unacceptable" and that GDR citizens feel deceived because of this.

Commenting on the situation, NEUES DEUTSCHLAND wrote today: "During the election struggle the CDU was often criticized for placing too great an emphasis on the fears that exist among people in the GDR. Now, however, the other parties are going to have to think about the question of whether they are creating reasons for such fears as a result of elections bought with the FRG mark."

Hungary's Nonobservance of 'Liberation Day' Noted

LD0404202890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] This year, for the first time, 4 April, the day of Hungary's liberation from fascism, has been announced as a working day instead of a public holiday. This is the decision taken by the leadership of a country which is undergoing a change of political system. Some extreme figures have even stated that 4 April is not liberation day, but the day of the start of a fresh occupation of the country. Many people in Hungary think that it is not 4 April that should be celebrated, but 9 May as the end of the Second World War. Discussion of this is continuing, but for the moment, albeit unofficially, rallies and festive soirees are being held in honor of the occasion.

Romanian Delegation's Moscow Activities Reported

PM0504082990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Romanian Delegation's Stay"]

[Text] A group of members of Romania's Provisional Council for National Accord headed by M. Kircumaru, chairman of the Romanian Socialist Democratic Party, is continuing its stay in Moscow.

The guests had a conversation 30 March at the CPSU Central Committee International Department. They touched on questions of the development of possible forms of cooperation. At the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences R.G. Yanovskiy, its rector and chairman of the Soviet-Romanian Friendship

Society Central Board, talked about the academy's work and promising avenues for mutual contacts.

A group of representatives of organizations from Romania's national minorities had conversations at "Rodina'-'—the Soviet society for cultural ties with compatriots abroad—and the Moscow patriarchate.

They also had meetings at the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee], the USSR Gosstroy [State Committee for Construction], and the USSR State Committee for Foreign Tourism.

The delegation left Moscow 31 March.

Gorbachev Hails Bulgaria's Mladenov on Presidency

PM0504084990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 90 Second Edition p 1

[Message from Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to Bulgarian President Mladenov]

[Text] To Petur Mladenov, chairman (president) of the People's Republic of Bulgaria:

Accept my cordial congratulations on your election as chairman (president) of the People's Republic of Bulgaria. I wish you successful activity in this lofty post in the implementation of profound democratic transformations in the country for the good of the Bulgarian people.

I express the hope that the traditional relations of friendship and all-around cooperation between the USSR and the People's Republic of Bulgaria will continue to develop fruitfully in the interests of our peoples and of stability and peace in Europe.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev.

West Europe

Role of West Germans in World War II Profiled

LD0404213290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A campaign has unfolded in the FRG concerning the graves of displaced persons discovered in the GDR. [V. Kondratyev, identified by caption] "Soviet Death Camps for Germans"; "Continuation of National Socialist Terror Methods on GDR Territory"; "Mass Graves in the Soviet Zone"—these are the headlines of the FRG media. [video shows clips of press articles, then shot of soldiers unearthing graves in woodland].

I don't want to confirm or to refute these reports; that is the task of specially qualified commissions. I want to speak about something else in this regard. [video shows sequence of archive footage showing bombed city, German soldiers being arrested, and shots of internment camps.]

The end of the bloodiest war in human history. A prostrate Germany lies in pieces. But even this sad picture cannot compare with what the Hitlerites left behind them in the East. The number of captive soldiers and hirelings of the Nazis runs into millions, and not just in the Soviet zone.

This is how American, British, and French internment camps looked. Only once here in the FRG—and then, on a "noteworthy" date, the 100th anniversary of Hitler's birthday—was I able to hear a report which seemed to flash past without any particular reaction, that hundreds of thousands of Germans died in the camps of the Western powers from cold, hunger, typhoid, dysentry, and tuberculosis, and that Nazis who were especially besmirched with blood were executed.

Yes, the conditions were hard. Yes, the Germans paid for the adventure of their leaders. But neither at that time nor later was there any question of deliberate genocide by the victors.

The right-wing press has resolved to furnish the current sensation, or rather what was originally presented as a sensation, with qualifications. The WELT AM SONNTAG asserts that Brandt, Schmidt and Bahr knew all about it.

Why make all this noise at this precise moment?

The forthcoming unification of German poses many questions. Jabs aimed at the Social Democrats who are alleged to have supported the terror and dictatorship can still be explained in terms of considerations of the internal election struggle. But the artificial inflation of this problem is without doubt capable of influencing the attitude of Germans toward the USSR, and toward Soviet servicemen in the GDR who even after unification are to remain at their positions for some time after unification.

If anyone sees in all this the possibility of exerting pressure on our country to make it more amenable in implementing the West German scenario of unification, then this is, indeed, a political game using worthless means.

FRG's Bahr Urges Replacement for Opposing Blocs

LD0504090390 Moscow TASS in English 0816 GMT 5 Apr 90

[Text] Bonn April 5 TASS—The Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO will fulfil their historical mission after German reunification, said Egon Bahr, expert on disarmament of the Social Democratic Group in the West German parliament.

In an interview with the party's PARLIAMENTARISCH-POLITISCHER PRESSEDIENST bulletin, he noted that the preservation of the two military and political blocs will have sense only in the transitional period. After it, new European structures of interaction should replace the opposing blocs.

European peoples now have a unique chance to overcome the split of the continent alongside the split of Germany, Bahr noted.

Bahr believes that the United States should revise its stand, according to which the stationing of U.S. troops on West German territory is linked with the deployment of nuclear arms there. It is difficult to imagine both U.S. and Soviet missiles located in a united Germany.

He expressed assurance that the Soviet Union would react in a similar way to the Western readiness to withdraw nuclear arms from Germany. The "two plus four" negotiations between the two Germanies and four post-war victor-states could include this issue, Bahr said.

FRG's Vogel on 'All-European Security Structure'

PM0404134390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 90 p 3

[Interview with SPD Chairman Hans-Jochen Vogel by K.-L. Guensche and S. Butkov under the rubric "United Germany: Opinions and Forecasts": "The Time Has Come to Disarm"; date, place not given; first paragraph is KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] Hans-Jochen Vogel, chairman of the SPD [Social Democratic Party of Germany] (FRG), believes that the time has come to disarm. Especially for KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA he granted an interview by telephone to a reporter for the Hamburg newspaper BILD-ZEITUNG and our correspondent.

[Question] West German Social Democrats believe that the process of Germany's unification must take place along the lines of integration among the "Common Market" member countries. How do you picture this?

[Vogel] The processes of rapprochement and unification must be interwoven. German reunification must take place in such a way that the integration of EEC states is not disrupted. In parallel with unification it is necessary to hold intensive talks with our neighbors in order to achieve the maximum possible mutual understanding.

[Question] In a number of countries neighboring the FRG and the GDR—both in the East and in the West—concern is being expressed that a united Germany could threaten these states' security. This question is being raised particularly acutely in Poland. Do you understand those who fear such consequences?

[Vogel] Yes, I can understand the concern of the Poles. But why has it come about? For several months Federal Chancellor H. Kohl stubbornly refused to give clear-cut guarantees that a united Germany will not have claims on Polish territories. But an unambiguous decision was adopted in this regard recently by the Bundestag, and the democratically elected GDR Volkskammer will also soon clearly express its position. On the basis of these two statements a point on the unshakable nature of the borders between the two states will be definitively enshrined in a future German-Polish treaty.

[Question] Another important question also demands a solution: Will a united Germany belong to NATO? Do Social Democrats see the possibility of this state's existence outside NATO?

[Vogel] The goal for which we strive is the creation of an all-European security structure embracing both military blocs: NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Interim steps are needed on the way to this, which will not result in a strengthening of the North Atlantic alliance's military might. It would be foolish to build up NATO's military potential at the same time as striving to eliminate the mutual threat.

[Question] But could a united Germany follow France's example, let us say, and be taken out of NATO's military structure, while at the same time essentially remaining a member of that alliance?

[Vogel] Various options are possible in principle. But we are now carefully analyzing which steps are reasonable. When our investigations are complete, the SPD will advance a joint proposal with its partner party in the GDR. But in any case the Social Democrats will proceed from the premise that a united Germany's military integration in NATO must be reduced to a minimum.

[Question] What do you think about a neutral Germany? Does such a solution seem possible to Social Democrats?

[Vogel] No, that is impossible. The existence of a neutral Germany with a population of approximately 80 million would be a destabilizing factor in Europe. So we believe that the new German state must remain within European structures, but all foreign troops must be withdrawn from its territory.

[Question] Two mighty armies now exist on German soil—the Bundeswehr and the National People's Army. What, in your view, should their fate be after the completion of the unification process?

[Vogel] The SPD advocates a substantial lowering of the new German state's military potential. And our specific proposal is to halve the Bundeswehr's strength—from half a million to 250,000 men. Of course, the armed forces in the GDR must also be reduced. We advocate creating a situation in which the German armed forces will be always ready for defense but not in a position to conduct offensive operations.

[Question] In this connection it is necessary, maybe, to formulate a new concept of disarmament in Europe?

[Vogel] First it is necessary to accelerate the talks in Vienna, so that its participants arrive more quickly at a joint decision. And then it is necessary at once to begin new talks—on the further substantial reduction of armed forces in Europe. The proposals already advanced in the disarmament sphere by the United States and the Soviet Union are taking us in the right direction. The SPD has always been a party which has advocated the elimination of military confrontation and the reduction of the giant

arsenals of mass-destruction weapons. And now is a very propitious time for achieving this goal.

[Question] But let us return to the problems of Germany's unification. The Soviet Government recently issued a statement in which it shares the GDR Government's position on the need for strict observance of law and order and the protection of the socioeconomic rights and interests of GDR citizens. It deals with property in the GDR. What do you think about this?

[Vogel] I believe that this is a question which must be resolved by the recently elected GDR Volkskammer. It must clearly formulate its stand and express it in the talks between the GDR and the FRG. I realize that few people in the GDR wish to alter the results of the 1945-1946 land reform (in the course of which 2,852,000 hectares of land was confiscated from war criminals and large landowners. It was placed at the disposal of peasants with little or no land, migrants, and people's estates—editor's note).

[Question] And your personal forecast: When will German unity be achieved?

[Vogel] I believe, within the next four years.

Kohl Hopes 1991 Will Be 'Year of Reunification'

LD0104135790 Moscow TASS in English 1336 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Text] Bonn April 1 TASS—West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, in an interview with the Deutshchlandfunk radio station, touched upon a number of domestic and foreign aspects of German reunification.

He reaffirmed the determination of the leadership of the Federal Republic, after a new government of East Germany is formed, to immediately begin intensive work to create a monetary, economic and social union of the two German states by summer this year. At the beginning of May the sides should be given a package of necessary measures for discussion, he said.

In answer to a question about further phases and timeframe for achieving German unity, the chancellor voiced hope that 1991 would become "the year of reunification and all-German elections".

"For such a great cause as reunification of the nation, this is historically a very short period of time", Kohl said. "We also need this period to coordinate all matters with our foreign partners, since reunification affects security policy. Important talks between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation lie ahead. From this point of view, the Soviet-U.S. summit this summer acquires exceptional importance.

"Besides we shall continue talks on disarmament in Vienna and other places. Meetings of the heads of state and government of the European Community member-states will be held in April and June to create important prerequisites for further development of the European unity process."

German reunification and European unity, Kohl emphasised, are "two sides of the same coin, they are interdependent and indivisible."

Touching upon the question of a military and political status of a reunited Germany, the chancellor again advocated its NATO membership.

"As far as NATO countries are concerned," he said, "it is perfectly clear to all of us that a reunited Germany should become a NATO member."

Kohl voiced hope that eventually a reasonable compromise will be reached with the Soviet Union, the compromise within the context of which a reunified Germany will be a NATO member.

Kohl, Thatcher London News Conference Reported

PM0304154190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS correspondent D. Voskoboynikov report: "Press Conference by M. Thatcher and H. Kohl"]

[Text] London, 31 Mar— "It is extremely important for the Lithuanian problem to be resolved by means of dialogue and discussions." This was stated by Prime Minister M. Thatcher of Great Britain at a press conference on the results of her talks with FRG Chancellor H. Kohl. "So much has been achieved in the Soviet Union under President Gorbachev that we are confident that this problem with all its difficulties will also be settled by means of dialogue and discussions," she stressed.

The head of the British Government said that attention during the talks with FRG Chancellor Kohl had focused on the discussion of the question of the unification of Germany. She noted that no "snap decisions" must be taken along the path toward the achievement of this goal, but she noted that the West German leader provided her with "very interesting information" about the development of events in this sphere, and that the sides had agreed to stay in "very close contact." The prime minister announced that Great Britain will fund a program to be launched by the British Council in the GDR to provide English language instruction for students and specialists.

Speaking at the press conference H. Kohl said that the talks had been "open and constructive." According to his opinion, relations with Great Britain are a "fundamental element" of the FRG's foreign policy. With reference to the process of the unification of Germany he noted that all-German elections may take place in the second half of next year. The FRG chancellor expressed the hope that British companies would invest in the "East German economy" which, according to his words, "could be turned into a thriving area." Subsequently in answer to a

question about his attitude to the Polish border he stressed: "I have stated clearly that we have no claims against Poland."

In the light of a recent statement by M. Thatcher that NATO may reduce the number of tactical nuclear missiles in Europe in the future, the prime minister was asked whether she would find the prospect of retaining only air-launched tactical missiles on the continent satisfactory. "This is a question which will have to be elaborated jointly with our partners in NATO," the head of the British Government declared. She noted further that in the course of the talks the sides had arrived at the opinion that it was important to have nuclear weapons on German territory.

H. Kohl said in turn that decisions on tactical nuclear missiles should be taken only after serious discussions. The chancellor noted that the question of retaining nuclear weapons in a united Germany cannot be isolated from other security issues. "We do not want special accords with respect to Germany—about its neutral status or demilitarization—because this would give Germany a special status. We know that this leads to isolation," H. Kohl said. There must not be different types of security for different parts of Germany, although this does not mean that there can be no "iterim decisions" in this sphere.

Thatcher Cited on Soviet Immigrants to Israel

PM0404154590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Apr 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "M. Thatcher's Interview"]

[Text] Kuwait, 2 Apr—In an interview in the Kuwaiti newspaper Al-QABAS British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher has advocated achieving a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict which would provide for the security of all the states in the region and guarantee the Palestinians' right to self-determination.

Touching on the question of the emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union to Israel, the British prime minister said: "Two aspects of the problem should be singled out. First, their right to leave the Soviet Union for anywhere. We fully support this right. Second, the settling of Jews on the occupied territories, including East Jerusalem. This settling is illegal and substantially hinders the process of seeking ways to a peaceful settlement. In this connection I would like to remind you of a proposal that I made earlier: to ensure that the Jews' legitimate rights to immigration are not realized at the expense of the rights, freedoms, and land of the people of the occupied territories."

Chernyshev on UK's Cold War Defense 'Signals'

LD0404142290 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 4 Apr 90

[By TASS military news analyst Vladimir Cherneyshev]

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS—The British Defence Ministry's "White Paper" was this year awaited with particular interest. And this is quite understandable. The radical political changes in the Soviet Union and East European countries, the cuts in the armed forces and armaments of the Warsaw Treaty member-states and the headway at the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe have substantially changed the strategic situation on the continent.

All this, as the British press repeatedly emphasised, prompted the need to fundamentally reconsider Britain's military strategy and plans for the development of the British Armed Forces.

The British media reported that analysts at the Defence Ministry and on Downing Stret thoroughly studied defence policy.

According to a military spokesman, the purpose was to send the right signals to both the East and NATO partners. The difficulties that were said to have arisen during the reconsideration process amounted mainly to the following: Officials were unable to coordinate the most appropriate "formula" setting out the government's attitude towards the changes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union and their likely impact on Britain's military policy.

Eventually the Defence White Paper has been made public. What kind of "signals" does it send to the East and West? Signal one: All key elements of British military policy are not subject to any changes.

Signal two: The country's military spending is to increase as compared with the previous year rather than decrease.

Signal three: No changes are to be introduced into the pattern of the armed forces and to the weapon development and production programmes that are being implemented.

These "signals," mildly speaking, are not future-oriented. They do not even conform to present-day realities. Frankly speaking, one gets the impression that they proceed from the postulates of the past and remind one of the cold war days.

As far as the "formula" of attitude to the changes on the continent is concerned, the formula which the British Government worked hard to elaborate, it has been set out by Defence Secretary Tom King in quite an original way.

While expressing hope for broader cooperation between all countries in Europe, he at the same time is stating that the Soviet Union may at any moment exploit the "weakness" of the West if the latter decides to curtail military development efforts.

It is precisely in this key that the entire document has been drawn up, presenting a strange combination of the

recognition of new realities taking shape in the world and calls "not to abandon vigilance" in the face of these changes.

It seems that the British Government did not justify the hopes of those Britons who expected that the relaxation of tension in the international arena would make it possible to slash military spending.

The Tory cabinet's decision to augment the military budget rather than to slash it is, in my opinion, yet another illustration of the British Government's continuing isolation in a period when there is widely-held opinion that benefit should be derived from new peace opportunities.

And still, one would like to hope that London has elaborated certain plans for future cuts in the budget, the armed forces and armaments, without making them public.

Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who is a convinced opponent of any unilateral disarmament, nevertheless favours negotiated reductions.

UK 'White Paper' on Defense 'Disappointing'

PM0504084790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[Aleksandr Lyutyy dispatch under the "Correspondent Comments" rubric: "See No Evil, Hear No Evil. Ministry of Defense 'White Paper'"]

[Text] London—The "White Paper" published today by Britain's Ministry of Defense, which usually sets out the main principles of the country's military policy for the coming few years, contains a number of surface innovations. One being a photograph of the Brandenburg Gate and the Berlin Wall, which remind you of the invigorating wind of change blowing across Europe.

But the Ministry of Defense document itself can by no means be described as an adequate reflection of these changes. Everything about Britain's military policy is still the same: stress on nuclear forces, including the continuation of the program of developing a nuclear submarine fleet carrying "Trident" ballistic missiles, the updating of certain types of conventional weapons, active participation in NATO, and preservation of British units on FRG territory. The warming of the international situation has had no effect on the overall total military expenditure: It is up by three percent in comparison with last year to total 21,233 million pounds.

You get the impression that in its military strategy Britain is now operating according to the "see no evil, hear no evil" principle. Incidentally, many of the country's leading politicians also derived this impression from the "White Paper." "The government verbally gives credit to the changes in Europe," Menzies Campbell, Social and Liberal Democrat defense spokesman, said, "but shows no willingness to act 'in conformity with these changes.'"

Admittedly the government disagrees. Defense Secretary Tom King indicated at a press conference following the publication of the "White Paper" that his department is currently conducting painstaking analytical work to review Britain's military priorities with a view to possible cuts in armed forces and arms, but the adoption of specific decisions will depend on the outcome of the Vienna conventional arms talks and the "two-plus-four" talks on Germany's future.

However, some representatives of the armed forces who are able to see the changes in Europe for themselves have already made their own choice without waiting for instructions from above. The "White Paper" points out with alarm the recent increasing trend toward early retirement from the British Army of the Rhine. Servicemen obviously do not believe very much the "White Paper's" maxims couched in the old spirit regarding the threat from the East. "Although the Soviets' predisposition to conduct military operations is on the decline," the defense secretary believes, "their military potential is greater than ever before."

Here are a few details that have no bearing on the overall thrust of the "White Paper." The Ministry of Defense has announced its intention to increase women's involvement in the armed forces. The army has manifested a definitely sympathetic attitude to the demands made by the environmental movement.

But my overall impression of the "White Paper"—one shared by most observers—is a disappointing one.

USSR, UK Foreign Ministry Aides Discuss Asia

PM0504082390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] The latest Soviet-British consultations on problems relating to the Asia-Pacific region were held in Moscow 29-30 March. I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister, and D. Gilmore, British permanent under secretary for foreign affairs, discussed, in particular, the prospects for achieving an all-embracing settlement in Cambodia and lessening tension on the Korean Peninsula.

D. Gilmore was also received by A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR first deputy foreign minister, and V.G. Komplektov, USSR deputy foreign minister.

Lithuanian Delegation's Talks in Sweden Reported

PM0404104290 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 31 Mar 90 p 12

[Unattributed report: "Letter From Landsbergis Asks Carlsson for Support"]

[Text] "We will never repudiate our declaration of independence of our own free will."

That was the message from the chairman of the Lithuanian parliament's Foreign Affairs Committee, Emanuelis Zingeris, at a press conference at the Foreign Ministry in Stockholm yesterday. Before the press conference Zingeris held talks with Foreign Minister Sten Andersson on the situation in Lithuania.

"We want an official Swedish reappraisal of its May 1941 recognition of Lithuania's incorporation into the Soviet Union."

However, Zingeris did not say whether he had received a promise of such a reassessment from Foreign Minister Andersson. Nevertheless he repeated several times that the aim of the Lithuanian delegation's trip—which has also taken in Denmark, Norway, and Iceland—has been to "reconfirm the Lithuanian declaration of independence," which in Zingeris' view the other Nordic countries had done to a greater extent than Sweden.

It was a strikingly young and determined delegation which appealed for support on the Lithuanian government's behalf. Zingeris himself, Foreign Affairs Committee Deputy Chairman Ramunas Bogdanas, and Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene's adviser Laima Andrikiene all seemed fresh out of high school.

They brought with them to Sweden a letter from President Vytautas Landsbergis to Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson—a letter in which Landsbergis gives an account of the situation in Lithuania and asks Sweden for its support for Lithuania's right to self-determination.

Asked whether in the talks with Sten Andersson the delegation had received any such assurances from Sweden, Zingeris replied:

"He said that Sweden is ready to give active and constructive aid to Lithuania and that various contacts in both the economic and political fields are necessary. But he also said that Sweden's approach to the question of independence can only be changed when Lithuania has control over its own territory. We consider that to be woolly, but we did not go into any details."

Zingeris claimed that the Lithuanian parliament today has full control and that the role of the army, like the question of border customs posts, will be resolved in negotiations with Moscow.

Asked whether the delegation touched on the criticism that Landsbergis has leveled at what he described as a weak Swedish response, Zingeris said that that matter was raised.

"But an unguarded word must not be allowed to harm relations. It is more important to us that the Swedish Government has said that it is ready to take on some sort of mediating role. Our actions could perhaps seem hasty to people who do not understand the tense situation in Lithuania, but we are living under gigantic pressure. It is David's fight against Goliath," Zingeris said.

Lithuanian 'Envoy,' Italian Fascist Link Deplored

PM0204161590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Italian Social Movement-National Right and Lithuania's Envoy: Embraces Exchanged"]

[Text] Rome, 30 Mar—"We are the first and so far the only ones," SECOLO D'ITALIA, the newspaper of the neofascist Italian Social Movement-National Right (MSI-DN) party, announced triumphantly today, reporting the meeting in Rome between its official delegation and Stasys Lozoraitis, "representative of the independent Lithuanian Republic in Washington and at the Vatican," on whom the powers of "envoy extraordinary and representative of the restored Lithuanian Republic proclaimed 11 March 1990" have been conferred by decree of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet.

The delegation of the neo-Fascist party was headed by Gianni Alemanno, the leader of "Youth Front," the party's youth organization. The report notes specifically that the meeting was authorized by Tommaso Staiti, who is responsible for the MSI-DN's international ties.

The neofascists briefed Lozoraitis on the intiatives which they are planning to launch "specifically in order to promote the cause of the Baltic republic's national independence." It is a question, in particular, of collecting signatures to a petition urging the Italian Government "immediately to recognize the Vilnius parliament in diplomatic terms."

Lozoraitis, the newspaper reports, concurred with them that the U.S. and West European governments have shown themselves "essentially indifferent" in this respect, and he "thanked them warmly for this first gesture which demonstrates active, concrete interest."

The delegation asked Lozoraitis to convey to the Lithuanian parliament a message from Pino Rauti, national secretary of the MSI-DN. It also asked "to be given an opportunity to organize a visit to Lithuania by a delegation of the party."

To ensure that the Lithuanian guest is left in no doubt, the extreme right explained without beating about the bush that "loyalty to European ideals and a firm anti-Soviet stance make it possible for the party to go further than any other political force in Italy."

According to the newspaper report "the meeting ended with warm embraces and a clear commitment to boost the permanent channel of political cooperation to ensure the full implementation of all the initiatives expounded, which met with Doctor Lozoraitis' full approval."

"How low can you sink?"—this is how Paolo Montacci, member of secretariat of the Perugia section of the National Association of Italian Partisans and deputy chairman of the local section of the National Association of Antifascist Victims of Political Persecution, evaluated the results of this meeting.

"Extremist forces in Lithuania are stubbornly striving for secession from the USSR. In this, as we can see, they have found zealous supporters in the shape of the Italian neofascists. Clearly, chauvinism and nationalism have provided the base on which anti-Soviet elements and the Blackshirts have met. All this can only evoke regret. I am confident that the true patriots of their country rather than the intriguers and separatists, people who sincerely believe in the genuine ideals of socialism, are perfectly aware that such contacts are not to their credit. We have not fought against fascism and Nazism to enable Blackshirts to visit the Soviet Union. As for Rauti, he is too dubious a character to merit mention," Paolo Montacci said.

Supreme Soviet Session

Moscow TV Airs Soviet of Nationalities Session

LD0404201690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 4 April begins carrying a recording of the 4 April session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Nationalities at the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1800 GMT session chairman Nishanov declares the session of the Soviet of Nationalities open, and gives the floor to Blokhin to deliver a report on the draft law on economic relations between the union and the union and autonomous republics. He details the various sections of the law and notes the proposed amendments which have been received.

At 1816 GMT Nishanov asks if there are any questions. Deputy Chernyak asks how this will affect the economic independence of the Baltic republics. Blokhin replies briefly.

Deputy Advadze asks about delineation of powers. Blokhin says this law does not contradict other laws on this subject.

At 1818 GMT Deputy Labunov asks about international cooperation and how this will be restricted by the draft law. Blokhin says this needs to be examined.

At 1820 GMT Deputy Ignatovich asks about the influence of the republic on union-subordinated enterprises.

At 1822 GMT Deputy Safarov asks whether enterprises include mines.

At 1823 GMT a deputy wonders whether there will be any contradiction with existing instructions.

At 1825 GMT Deputy Moshnyaga asks whether the draft will abolish monopoly from the center. Blokhin is sure that it will. He asks about the effect on the forthcoming price-formation changes.

At 1827 GMT a deputy asks why the term "metrological service" has not been used. Nishanov says it can be introduced as an amendment. He prefers the original version of one particular article.

At 1830 GMT a deputy asks how the economic independence of the republics will be protected, and where is the mechanism for this? Nishanov names the legal experts who contributed to the draft on this, and asks one of them to reply.

At 1832 GMT Deputy Lomanov explains the mechanism for compensating losses caused by violations of contract relations.

At 1835 GMT a deputy complains that there is no mention of inventors' activities in the draft.

At 1836 GMT Deputy Yetylen makes a minor drafting suggestion. Nishanov asks for this to be put in writing.

At 1837 GMT Deputy Angapov questions the principles of relations with smaller autonomous formations.

At 1841 GMT Deputy Chekhoyev suggests that autonomous oblasts and okrugs should be included in the title of the law.

At 1846 GMT Deputy Likhanov calls for the bill to give children more protection. More local economic independence will not help public health protection.

At 1852 GMT Deputy Advadze says that the essence of the bill which he calls the "Maslyukov bill," has not changed; it does not give any independence to the autonomous formations. Secession is the only path left to the republics. The system which brought the economy to crisis cannot get it out again.

At 1855 GMT Nishanov says the draft is the work of a commission, not of Maslyukov.

At 1856 GMT Fedorov says that many instructions exist concurrently and at times contradict each other. The draft should render all contradictory ones invalid.

At 1900 GMT a deputy refers back to Advadze's remarks and notes how many deputies took part in drafting the bill.

At 1902 GMT Deputy Shevchenko talks about licensing of goods for the international market. Goods have been exported which are needed for the home market. The licensing measure is a temporary one to prevent such abuses.

At 1907 GMT Deputy Yetylen talks about capital construction and the conditions that should be created for it. He talks about ways of settling economic disputes among autonomous formations.

At 1910 GMT Deputy Mongo proposes to amend headings and certain articles to emphasize the gurantee of economic independence for autonomous formations.

At 1912 GMT Deputy Ulugbekov reminds his colleagues of the urgency of the issue and the need to adopt the bill as soon as possible. Changing the name and headings is not really that important; it is more important to bring in an effective act.

At 1916 GMT Advadze asks for the floor, to explain why he named the legislation the "Maslyukov bill."

At 1919 GMT Nishanov says that 12 deputies have spoken and proposes the house go over to an article-by-article vote. The bill is aodpted by 162 votes to 17, with one abstention. Next, the Soviet votes to put the act into effect by 161 votes to 12, with eight abstentions.

Moscow TV Carries Soviet of Union Session

LD0404211690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1925 GMT on 4 April continues its recording of

the 4 April Supreme Soviet session with the Soviet of the Union session in the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1925 GMT session chairman Laptev opens the sitting of the Soviet of the Union by asking the deputies to welcome a delegation of the Western European Union. They are greeted with applause.

At 1926 GMT Deputy Blokhin takes the floor to outline the commission amended bill on economic relations between the union and the republics. He says more than 120 suggestions, observations and comments were taken into consideration. With reference to the deputies' text, he proceeds to list the proposed amendments point-by-point.

At 1940 GMT Laptev asks for questions from the floor. Deputy Abdullayeva asks why the proposed amendment to name the bill "On Socioeconomic Relations" rather than "On Economic Relations" was rejected. Blokhin replies that economic relations subsume social aspects. Abdullayeva also asks for elucidation on clauses referring to pricing and taxation of profits.

AT 1944 GMT Deputy Kazamarov asks for clarification of budgetary terminology.

At 1946 GMT Deputy Amaglobeli asks what "republic" will mean once the law is implemented.

At 1947 GMT an unidentified deputy asks about the lack of clarification of republican powers in the fields of education, health, culture and so on.

At 1949 GMT an unidentified female deputy asks for clarification about integrated socioeconomic development as covered by Article 2 and on regulations regarding new construction projects as her area is worried by this.

At 1952 GMT another unidentified deputy raises the question of the principles of frontier customs regulations and who is responsible for them. He also raises the matter in Article 3 with reference to republican budgets.

At 1956 GMT Deputy Ostroukhov asks about separation of powers regarding land registration in Article 1.

At 1959 GMT an unidentified deputy rises to say that there is no need to differentiate between union and autonomous republics.

At 2000 GMT Kalmykov of the legislative committee asks for the floor. He says that the bill has to agree with some of the laws adopted earlier and proceeds to examine some of the points which he thinks conflict with these. He says he has talked with the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court on these matters.

At 2008 GMT Laptev asks for proposals to move to article-by-article voting, then puts to the vote the adoption of the law as a whole. The voting is 166 for, eight against, with three abstentions. The law is adopted. He puts to the vote the decision on bringing law into effect. The voting is 165 for, six against, with two abstentions. The decision is adopted.

Supreme Soviet Chambers Discuss Economic Bill

LD0404214490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 4 April carries a 26-minute "diary" of the proceedings at the 4 April separate sessions of the Soviet of Nationalities and the Soviet of the Union at the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin. The reporters are Marina Novitskaya and Andrey Nikiforov.

First Novitskaya reports on the Soviet of Nationalities session which discussed the draft law on the foundations of economic relations between the USSR and the union and autonomous republics in its second reading. She presents voice recordings of excerpts of speeches by different deputies including the speech by Blokhin, a member of the working group. Novitskaya then explains the background to the introduction of an amendment making it incumbent upon local administrative bodies to ensure the freedom of enterprises. Later in her report Novitskaya introduces the remarks made by Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, on the subject under discussion. Nishanov's recorded voice says:

"Comrades, you can see how topical the draft law is that we are discussing. It does not just contain the general principles of the management of the economy, but the idea is to rectify legislatively the crudest distortions in economic and social development that were perpetrated in the years of the cult of personality and the years of stagnation. Of course, although discussion of this matter transcends the articles of the draft law, I can see that both the speech by Deputy Likahnov and the speech by Deputy Kiseleva and other comrades reveal the pain that our deputies feel for the particular social condition of individual regions of our society. I understand the pain of the comrades from the Central Asian republics, where this social injustice and backwardness is to be seen in its starkest form. At the same time I'd like to ask you not to contrast some regions with others, nor to think that in some places things are very good and elsewhere they are very bad. It's just that in the sphere of social development we are experiencing serious distortions and deformations everywhere. The law we want to adopt aims to ensure that, locally, the republics themselves—autonomous and union ones—and autonomous okrugs, and oblasts, all the oblasts and krays, all local soviets, can utilize their own natural resources and the potential of their own enterprises and institutions and so on, to meet the needs of the population, and above all women and children. So, overall, I support this activity designed to draw the attention of all public opinion to this problem."

Eventually, the Soviet of Nationalities adopts the bill and the Supreme Soviet decision on the procedures for bringing the law into effect from 1 January 1991.

Presenter Nikiforov then describes the proceedings at the Soviet of the Union session which also discussed the draft bill on economic relations. After discussion the draft bill and the supreme soviet procedures relating to it are voted on and passed. Nikiforov ends his report.

Economic Links Viewed

LD0404104390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0900 GMT on 4 April broadcasts a report by Olga Vasilenko from the Moscow Kremlin, where the Soviet of Nationalities is in session. The session is giving a second reading to the draft law on the bases of the economic relations between the USSR and the union republics.

The reading is presented by Yuriy Vitaliyevich Blokhin, deputy chairman of the Committee on Economic Reform, and a member of the deputies' commission set up to work on this draft. Vasilenko quotes Blokhin as saying that it will help to set up realistic economic links between union and autonomous republics that will be mutually advantageous and will take their independence into account.

In the debate, Vasilenko says, a proposed amendment to expand the law to cover autonomous oblasts and okrugs as well as autonomous republics was rejected. She comments that attempts to expand the independence of such oblasts and okrugs are made often. A new union treaty would deal with this matter. Some deputies want clearer definitions of the mechanism to protect the economic independence of the republics and the responsibility of the union for losses that the republics might incur.

Economic Relations Bill Passed 4 Apr

LD0404164490 Moscow TASS in English 1631 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, April 4 TASS—The two chambers of the Soviet parliament—the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities—in separate meetings today approved the second reading of a bill on fundamentals of economic relations between the union and constituent and autonomous republics.

A resolution passed today says that the law will come into effect on January 1, 1991, and that all resolutions and instructions of the government that contradict it will become null and void.

The law considerably expands the authority of constituent and autonomous republics in the fields of finance, taxation, investment policy, and uses of nature.

The republics receive the right to independently carry out foreign economic activities and planning, form the budget, and even suspend decisions by federal bodies if republican rights are violated.

The range of the union's competence continues to include the establishment of single legislative foundations of the economic activity and the federal market, the organization of the country's taxation system, the implementation of a common price-formation policy, the organization of the financial-credit system and single monetary circulation, the management of single transport and energy systems, and some other functions.

After the bill's discussion in the first reading, when many deputies called for guarantees of enterprises' independence, the bill was considerably amended. Now it proclaims that economic relations between enterprises and republican and local management bodies should be built on a contract basis.

The law also contains guarantees against anti-market measures. It says that federal and autonomous republics have no right to introduce limitations on the import and export of goods and financial resources and to introduce transit payments without the consent of other republics.

Supreme Soviet Discusses Law on Federation

LD0404121990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Correspondent Olga Vasilenko report from Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin]

[Text] [Vasilenko] You probably already know that the Supreme Soviet chambers are working separately today. Since this morning the Soviet of Nationalities has been in session discussing another draft law, connected with resolving matters concerning our federative state. The title of this document is as follows: On the Foundations of Economic Relations Between the USSR and the Union and Autonomous Republics. This is the bill's second reading. Since the first reading it has undergone substantial changes; at that time more than 120 proposals and observations were submitted, including from the Council of Ministers.

By the way, the actual title of the law has also changed, which had previously been designated: On the General Principles of Managing the Economic and Social Sphere of the Union and Autonomous Republics. And today a proposal was submitted to make a further change, adding to the title: autonomous oblasts and okrugs. That is, you can probably sense even from this transformation the deputies' endeavor to establish maximum independence for all national formations.

[Announcer] These nuances place, so to speak, the emphasis.

[Vasilenko] Of course, so I'll tell you everything in sequence. The bill was presented to deputies by Yuriy Vitalyevich Blokhin, member of the deputies' preparatory commission which was set up specially to revise it. He said that this document is the result of the work of five committees and commissions, as the Council of

Ministers' draft—Deputy Advadze even called it the Maslyukov bill—had previously been rejected.

Wherein lies the meaning, the concept of this law? It primarily determines the foundations of the economic realtions between the union and the union and autonomous republics. It is, I quote, based on the principles of federalism, economic independence, and mutual responsibility of the USSR and of the union and autonomous republics. Its articles delineate the powers of the union and of the republics in the economic sphere. As Blokhin said, this law, or rather, for the moment, bill, brings together everything concerning the independence of the republics that has been previously adopted, that is, the law on ownership, on land, on taxation, on the economic independence of the Baltic republics, on the presidency, and so on.

But to give a more precise picture of the bill, I'll say that it consists of nine articles; that is, the competence of the union in the economic sphere, the foundations of the economic independence of the union and autonomous republics, the foundations of finance and budget relations between the union and the republics, and there is also an article on the all-union market. The point at issue is guarantees of the independence not only of the republics, but also of such autonomous entities as oblasts, okrugs and local soviets, and the responsibility of the union and the republics for failure to fulfill commitments.

It was noted in the report that, if the law is adopted, it will enable economic reform to be developed across the board. It would appear that everything is balanced and well worked out, but nevertheless deputy after deputy came to the rostrum and said that, even in such improved form, it should pass through expert examination by the union republics, and it needs to be worked on further—which deputies are now actually doing at their session. There is a break at the moment, it's difficult as yet to predict the fate of this bill, so we'll work on here, and I think we'll tell our radio listeners in more detail about everthing that happens subsequently.

Commission Chairman Vilkus Resigns

LD0304131990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 3 Apr 90

[By Kremlin correspondent Marina Novitskaya]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] One more question was discussed by the Soviet of Nationalities today. A difficult situation has developed in the Commission on Issues of Social and Economic Development of Union and Autonomous Republics, Oblasts and Okrugs. Vilkus, its chairman, has been relieved from his duties at his own request. There is a need for the new authoritative person in his place. [passage omitted]

The final decision will be announced tomorrow.

New Deputy Registered From Academy of Sciences

PM0404153590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "At the Central Electoral Commission for Elections of USSR People's Deputies"]

[Text] On the basis of the official returns of the Electoral Commission for Elections of USSR People's Deputies from USSR Academy of Sciences Scientific Societies and Associations and in accordance with Articles 57 and 62 of the Law on Elections, the Central Electoral Commission has registered as a deputy Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Nikolskiy, a leading scientific staffer at the M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University's Biological Faculty and a nonparty person who lives in Moscow City and was elected 22 March 1990 from the USSR Academy of Sciences Scientific Societies and Associations.

Lukyanov Interviewed on Supreme Soviet Work

PM0304111590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Apr 90 Second Edition p 3

[Interview with A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by O. Losoto and A. Chernyak: "Position: Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet"; date and place unspecified]

[Text] It had been a busy day. The USSR Supreme Soviet was in session. Anatoliy Ivanovich was chairing the session. The first session of the USSR Presidential Council had been held the same day. As chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, he had taken part in its work. In the afternoon he returned to the USSR Supreme Soviet session.

We had arranged to meet in the evening. We waited for him in the reception room. The evening sitting came to a close. Anatoliy Ivanovich arrived, accompanied by several deputies.

"Could you wait for about 10 minutes?" he asked us.

But even more deputies appeared. They all had urgent questions requiring an immediate answer....

It was already about 2000 hours when Anatoliy Ivanovich appeared in reception and invited us into his office.

"How long do we have?"

"...About 40 minutes.... Let us sit somewhere a little further away from the telephones...."

We sat down at a small round table next to a bookcase. We switched on the dictaphone.

[PRAVDA correspondents] Anatoliy Ivanovich, the decisions of the Extraordinary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which instituted the presidential system, have taken the country to a new stage of political development. In this connection, what is the role played

by representative organs—the congress and the Supreme Soviet—in today's political structure?

[Lukyanov] I do not think that the place and role of the representative organs—the congress and the Supreme Soviet—has changed at the present stage. Not one—I emphasize, not one—article on the prerogatives of the supreme organ of power was amended to any significant extent in the congress decisions, which means that its role remains unaffected. However, presidential power will make it possible to better implement decisions taken by the representative organs.

Of course, changes will be made to the work of the highest echelon of state power as a result of the institution of the presidency. But, in my view, this is not rivalry but cooperation, with functions clearly demarcated and counterbalances preserved.

Our president is a special figure incorporated into the system of full soviet power. He is the highest state official, who brings together the representative and executive-administrative organs and personifies the unity of soviet power in our country. Consequently, he has a vested interest in maintaining the representative organs' high level of authority. The president has the right of legislative initiative and can submit his own proposals for consideration by the representative organs. He is also involved, I would say, in the struggle for good-quality laws, possessing as he does such specific rights as the deferral veto, i.e. he can return a document to the Supreme Soviet for further discussion if, for example, he sees that a law has been passed by a small number of votes, or if he has doubts as to whether a legislative act conforms with constitutional principles. You could say that the president is, to a considerable extent, a guarantor of the quality of the laws passed and also of their strict implementation. That is why I am confident that presidential power will help strengthen the authority and the effectiveness of implementation of the decisions adopted by the legislative organs.

[PRAVDA correspondents] The PRAVDA mailbag contains many letters about the presidency. This new institution of power has prompted considerable interest among the public, but most questions still come down to how parliament and the president are going to collaborate. Followed by relations with the government....

[Lukyanov] I think that this triangle will work in the same direction and implement the same policies. But each organ has its own special functions. The supreme organ of representative power is being preserved in the form of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, while legislative and monitoring authority is the domain of the Supreme Soviet. The executive-administrative organ responsible for exercising the will of the people and implementing laws is also being preserved, i.e. the government. Given this kind of structure, the president's most important function is to coordinate the work of these organs.

We are working in parallel in this respect. But in the same direction. Different functions but the same direction. But each organ must work with a far greater sense of responsibility. With regard to the two new councils, one of them, the Council of the Federation, will consist of top state officials from all the union republics, while the other, the Presidential Council, will be the organ responsible for drafting measures to implement the main aspects of domestic and foreign policy and to ensure national security. There is no overlap of functions. I have heard that these councils under the president are already referred to as the councils of national security and national accord. That is right. As a whole, the main thrust is to achieve the closest possible cooperation between parliament and the president.

[PRAVDA correspondents] But there could be some differences of approach....

[Lukyanov] Of course there will be arguments, of course there will be some differences of opinion, but we will work as a team for perestroyka and for more radical reforms in all areas: economic, political, and legal. There is no going back, the only way is forward.

[PRAVDA correspondents] In connection with the change in the highest echelon of state power, what do you now see as the most vital issues facing the Supreme Soviet?

[Lukyanov] As far as I am concerned the most important issues today are those connected primarily with ensuring society's stable development. We are on the threshold of a multiparty system. All kinds of trends, ideas, and groups of deputies united on professional, regional, and national grounds meet, come together, and link up with each other in the Supreme Soviet. Consequently, as an organ of political pluralism in action, the Supreme Soviet must first try to unite these movements in one direction: the perestroyka salient. Its second important task is to ensure the correct, internationalist solution to the interethnic problems—serious interethnic problems—which life has given us. In this respect the Supreme Soviet, its Soviet of Nationalities, and its committees and commissions must do an enormous amount of work and pool the efforts of deputies of various nationalities. For this reason, approximately half of the Supreme Soviet sittings will evidently be separate sittings for the two chambers, so that each one of them—the Soviet of the Union reflecting all-union interests and the Soviet of Nationalities reflecting national interests—works to implement the main functions of the supreme organ. Its third task, which is also extremely difficult, as far as I can see, is to enhance the quality of the laws and decisions adopted by the Supreme Soviet.

[PRAVDA correspondents] That question was on the tip of our tongue: Are you satisfied with the quality of laws?

[Lukyanov] I will be frank, I am not totally satisfied. There are many reasons for this. They include insufficient professionalism. Also the fact that, when trying to coordinate different viewpoints and to ensure that the

law in question reflects the various aspects of people's opinions, we often lose sight of the law's original objective and its ability to hit home, so to speak. That is why we end up with several abstract laws with a weak mechanism of implementation and, as a result of this, difficulties connected with putting them into practice. However, by pooling our efforts, we can achieve a qualitatively new level of legislation. We have produced a fair number of laws in the past that were no more than wishes or declarations, so now we must learn to create laws of action. We must really firmly observe Lenin's behest in this respect: We must legislate with extreme circumspection and look before we leap.

I would also like to mention another exceptionally important factor in enhancing the Supreme Soviet's role. The fact is that, when working on laws—and working fairly efficiently—the Supreme Soviet nevertheless does not fully exercise its powers either with regard to subordinate organs or in connection with monitoring how these organs comply with our laws: A great deal has still to be done in this direction. An important role will be played by the Supreme Soviet itself and also its chambers, committess, and commissions.

[PRAVDA correspondents] In your speech at the congress immediately after your election as chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet you said that "we need democracy in practice." What did you mean by this?

[Lukyanov] What did I mean by this? Both the congress and the Supreme Soviet are still organs whose work contains an element of soapbox democracy. Often, instead of comparing standpoints in a debate and establishing exactly what the problem is, people start getting into personalities. We are still unable to avoid this element and create the kind of system that will work efficiently and, at the same time, boost democracy throughout the country. With the broadcasting of its sittings on television, the Supreme Soviet has become a school of political and juridical education for the whole country. It is a kind of all-union university. But this university must really be a top-grade university. The union republics' new supreme soviets and local soviets will see it as an example. Naturally, we cannot allow it to be a university of undeveloped democracy. Democracy demands responsibility, strictness of approach, and a high degree of organization. We still have to tackle all this.

[PRAVDA correspondents] But what about these television broadcasts? After all, there are different viewpoints....

[Lukyanov] That is still undecided. We have received a great many letters in which people say that the broadcasts must continue. But there are some issues, connected with work organization, that concern deputies alone; there are also many interethnic questions which, if sent out on air, could be received in society in different ways. Then disputes and clashes of opinion at the top could extend to the whole country. So there are some limiting factors in this respect—clearly there must be.

But we have acted cautiously and transferred this question to the Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals Committee so that it can study the matter from every angle and make its own proposals. I personally am still in favor of continuing this tradition, but it is better to organize the sittings... Ye. Yevtushenko has graphically described our parliament as "an office behind glass walls." That is indeed so. Everyone should be able to see and participate in the discussions which develop there.

There have been an increasing number of letters recently in which people say that deputies are often too free with their time and devote too much attention to making speeches which have no positive basis. Television viewers and radio listeners have very strong views on this, and we must bear this in mind. I have discussed this more than once at sittings and at meetings with deputies.

[PRAVDA correspondents] It is a question of organization and discipline. After all, it sometimes happens that there is no quorum at sittings....

[Lukyanov] There are several reasons for this. They include organization and discipline on the part of individual deputies. Some deputies are either ill, on trips to foreign countries or in our own country, or working in some commission. Sometimes republic-level measures take precedence over union measures. All deputies are public figures. They try to take part in republic-level measures and to be in a working environment. Therefore there is nothing terrible in having 400, 420, or 450 people present. This makes it possible to adopt decisions. It is another matter when certain deputies start ostentatiously walking out of sessions. This, of course, does no good at all.

[PRAVDA correspondents] Anatoliy Ivanovich, there are many different groups and associations in the Supreme Soviet. This is, so to speak, the practical realization of pluralism. How do you assess their work?

[Lukyanov] In general, by the way, this is proof that not only a multiparty parliament can be effective. Pluralism, including political pluralism, is perfectly possible with just one party in our parliament. It helps us to better ascertain positions on all questions under discussion.

Several deputies' groups have already taken shape in the Supreme Soviet. They are very active and act precisely as groups. There are, for example, ecologists, who have submitted their own draft nature conservation program. There is a group of scientists which has put forward proposals on ensuring security and stability in the country. Agrarian deputies are working persistently on ways to develop our agriculture. A group of women has prepared proposals together with the corresponding committee to improve the position of women in production and in other spheres of life. There is an energetic group of young parliamentarians which includes deputies who served in Afghanistan. As soon as groups began

to be formed on a republic basis which frequently stand guard, above all, over their own republic interests, the "Union" deputies' group came into being. It has approximately 140 members in the Supreme Soviet, but there were more than 300 at the congress. The interregional deputies' group is active in various situations.

Patience, tolerance, and will are all required of the Supreme Soviet chairman—in short, he must pay attention to every deputy and every group. It is said that Lukyanov must be impartial. Of course, I cannot be completely impartial. That is impossible. I am and will remain a communist. At the same time I proceed from the premise that it was precisely my party in its precongress platform that offered a dialogue to all forces pursuing the course of perestroyka. And I will do everything to develop this dialogue.

[PRAVDA correspondents] Our parliament has been in existence for one year now.

[Lukyanov] Yes, it will be one year old in May.

[PRAVDA correspondents] The time is approaching to carry out the rotation of the Supreme Soviet. How will this be done? And when?

[Lukyanov] Rotation is now provided for in the appropriate articles of the standing orders. And the rotation will evidently be carried out at the next, scheduled Congress. We are preparing for it. One-fifth of the Supreme Soviet's members are to be renewed. And it has to be said that a group of deputies has already come to light which is agreeable to making way for other deputies. We now have no special distinction between a member of the Supreme Soviet and those people who are simply USSR people's deputies. More than 900 deputies are working on committees and commissions. We endeavor to brief the deputies who work in outlying districts, and we send them draft laws and the materials which are issued to deputies who are members of the Supreme Soviet.

[PRAVDA correspondents] A question of a personal nature, Anatoliy Ivanovich. We realize that you have little free time. But, clearly, you still get some at some time. How do you use your personal time?

[Lukyanov] It can only hypothetically be called personal time. I must be constantly surrounded by the thoughts and ideas with which the country is preoccupied. Particularly as, in practice, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet has neither Saturdays nor, quite frequently, Sundays free. Of course, I have some personal plans. Even if I get only a small amount of free time, I seek to spend it in the mountains. Since 1954 my wife and I have endeavored to go walking. She is a doctor of sciences, a biophysicist in charge of a laboratory at an institute of the Academy of Medical Sciences.

I have a large library. I have spent approximately 40 years assembling it. It is mostly poetry—Blok, Yesenin, Andrey Belyy, Voloshin, Mayakovskiy, Akhmatova. Poets from the beginning of the century are particularly close to me. Sometimes you come home tired and cannot read anything more at all. But you pick up a poet's slim volume and read two or three poems, and it is like gulping fresh air. And my second passion is the history of our homeland. I endeavor to read everything on Russian history, starting with Karamzin, Solovyev, and Klyuchevskiy. When I cannot define my stand on some modern question, I frequently take one and the same episode in Russian history described by different historians. Pokrovskiy and Grekov, let us assume, or Ilovayskiy and Kostomarov, let us say. And I begin comparing them.

[PRAVDA correspondents] What about this library in your office.... On what principle has it been put together?

[Lukyanov] It is my working library. Literature on the legislation of different countries.

I am a jurist, a specialist in state management. Of course, I have to read a lot of special literature. I have recently had to make a thorough study of Russian parliamentarianism and the history of the Duma, to look through its protocols and standing orders, and to absorb myself in the arguments that took place then. It is quite instructive material, although, of course, both the times and the arguments were different. Russian parliamentarianism and the Russian parliament born in the storms of the 1905 revolution are a quite distinctive landmark which we too must know pretty well before turning to the experience of Western parliaments.

[PRAVDA correspondents] What task do you personally set yourself, as a human being?

[Lukyanov] I belong to the generation of the 20th congress. For me everything began then, during 1953-1956. The years of stagnation, when there was a desire to do more but the situation did not permit it, canceled out much of what had been planned. Then my generation had to back down with difficulty and for a long time. Although anything was possible in life, particularly if you consider that I began my adult life during the war years as a defense plant worker. These are our times now. They are complex and formidable. But, as the poet said: "Blessed is he who visited this world in its fateful minutes." To do everything to give people a better and freer life—this is probably what human happiness consists in. But for everyone it is always beyond the horizon, always ahead.

[PRAVDA correspondents] Thank you very much. Today has been a tough day. Is this a usual work day for you?

[Lukyanov] My day is entirely mapped out.

[PRAVDA correspondents] Could we see the schedule for your usual work day?

[Lukyanov] Right away. [Lukyanov breaks off]

A.I. Lukyanov picked up his engagement diary from the table. The pages were covered with writing in a small hand. Times, names. Meetings, conversations, telephone calls. From morning through evening. Until late in the evening. Including Saturdays. Frequently taking in Sundays too.

[PRAVDA correspondents] Anatoliy Ivanovich, two pictures are hanging in your office....

[Lukyanov] Yes, they portray mountains. They are always with me. [Lukyanov ends]

We took our leave. The floodlit Kremlin lay outside the windows.

The work day of the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman was continuing.

Political & Social

Yeltsin's Suitability for Elected Office Questioned

PM0404101590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Apr 90 Second Edition p 3

[Letter from Vladimir Kozhevnikov, leading designer and communist, from Odintsovo, Moscow Oblast: "'I Am One of the Silent Majority'"]

[Text] I have never written to the newspapers, I am one of the silent majority, although I spent approximately 15 years in propaganda work.

This is the event that compelled me to write, moreover I wrote as soon as I heard it, but I did not mail the letter—I decided to see how events developed. Nothing ensued.

BBC Radio announced the publication of B. Yeltsin's memoirs in the West 25 February. Yeltsin the memoirist—a remarkable fact in itself. Presumably Yeltsin decided to write his biography himself without waiting for someone else to do it—and explain, so to speak, at first hand the metamorphosis of a cadre party apparatchik into a man with a perfect knowledge of the methods of the administrative-edict system, a "crusader against the commercial mafia," the leader of the interregional group and so-called "Democratic Russia," and the ally and favorite of the shadow economy and Soviet social democracy, which is sprouting within the CPSU.

The BBC deemed it necessary to dwell on just two small excerpts from Yeltsin's memoirs.

The first and, perhaps, the main one. Extremely calmly and impartially Yeltsin announces that in 1976, whilst first secretary of the CPSU obkom [oblast party committee], he gave instructions for the Ipatyevs' house in Sverdlovsk (Yekaterinburg) to be demolished—the house where the last Russian czar Nikolay II, who had abdicated, his wife, children, and members of his household were shot. The house was demolished by bulldozers at night and the area asphalted over. Yeltsin also says that there was a secret CPSU Central Committee Politburo decree regarding the elimination of the Ipatyevs' house, which was a place of pilgrimage for many people, and that he, Yeltsin, could not fail to fulfill this decree.

In 1956 and 1957 I went to gather in the harvest on the virgin lands in Altay Kray as part of a Moscow Higher Technical School detachment. Every time we traveled through Sverdlovsk, we students got out at the station, took taxis, and drove to the Ipatyevs' house. We went there first and then on to the Ural Political Institute and Uralmashzavod.... I only learned that the house had been demolished last year. To what can this crime be compared? How can crimes be compared at all? But if we are to make comparisons, then I can think of nothing but the destruction of the Christ the Savior Church in Moscow. And if Kaganovich is cursed by Russia forever, what about Yeltsin? How can this unquashable functionary be elected to any seat, enjoy people's trust, and reach out his hands for Monomakh's crown [symbol of imperial power]. Have we really stooped so low? Have we really learned nothing? Come to your senses, Russian people!

(A more than strange coincidence: Both Kaganovich and Yeltsin have held the post of Moscow party gorkom [city party committee] first secretary).

Two days later BBC Radio once again drew attention to Yeltsin (that is the kind of one-sided glasnost we have in our country, where we have to turn to foreign sources for information). This time the BBC correspondent interviewed a resident of Sverdlovsk called Ye. Krutov—if I correctly recall the surname—Yeltsin's rival in the electoral okrug during the elections to the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. During his first meeting with the voters Ye. Krutov received a note from the hall: "How dare you take votes away from Boris Nikolayevich?" To which he replied: I previously supported Yeltsin, but now I have thoroughly investigated him, and will fight against him.

Lastly. I ask the editorial office to institute an investigation and find out whether there really was a secret Politburo decree (resolution), who took part in its adoption, and on whose initiative it was adopted. The Ipatyevs' house was left untouched during the civil war, it remained standing during the years of the cult of Stalin, and Krushchev's voluntarism....

I ask you to publish this letter.

With respect,

Vladimir Kozhevnikov, leading designer and communist. Odintsovo, Moscow Oblast.

Spanish Daily Interviews Vadim Zagladin

PM0404080090 Madrid DIARIO 16 in Spanish 20 Mar 90 p 18

[Interview with CPSU Central Committee member Vadim Zagladin by Arturo Arnalte in Madrid; date not given]

[Excerpt] [Introductory passage omitted] [Arnalte] You are a historian specializing in the workers' movement. Can perestroyka be regarded as a more important revolution than that of 1917?

[Zagladin] In 1917 the working class and the peasants seized power in Russia, but the country was not sufficiently developed economically. This created a difficult situation for us. We had no specific blueprint for socialism. We were seeking one. It was necessary to create the economic machinery. Lenin understood this very well, but did not have time to do so. After his death, the process was curbed.

Stalin was very authoritarian in politics, and in the economy he created very strict centralization, because he was looking to a very distant future. As far as he was concerned, people were just instruments—cogs in a very big machine.

In his era we switched from being an agricultural country to being an industrialized and literate country, thanks to which we won in the war against fascism. But despite this, difficulties were accumulating, and society was reaching a dead end. While the world was continuing to develop, we were falling behind.

Perestroyka meant breaking with the old and beginning a new search for a path of development. We must transcend dogmatic, bureaucratic, and simplistic approaches, and abandon the totalitarianism which alienated people from the government and workers from the product of their work.

Socialist ownership can exist in various forms. We must also change the attitude to the social democratic movement. But the most difficult thing is that we must change everything at once. We must not be too late.

Perestroyka takes up again the ideals of the workers' movement, but in order to carry them forward, without our parting company with the other progressive movements in the world.

[Arnalte] Are not the Soviet people disconcerted by this sudden change in the values in which they were brought up?

[Zagladin] Yes, it is a difficult process for the people. It is difficult to reform the system, but it is even more difficult to reform their outlook. For 70 years our people have created negative stereotypes—for instance, the stereotype of equality. People's talents and abilities differ, and even if there is social equality, we realize that there cannot be equality of income. Everybody wants to be on an average level. This runs counter to the economic reforms.

[Arnalte] What is the degree of mass acceptance of the reforms?

[Zagladin] If we consider the people's attitude, we find that they support us. In an opinion poll conducted with the French, 70 percent of the population said that perestroyka is correct but slow, 17 percent want the same pace to be maintained, and only five percent want to return to the old methods.

This change is unprecedented for us. In politics we had the stereotype of unanimity. We always believed that our society was a monolith.

But this was not so in the past, it is not so now, and it will not be so in the future. Now we realize this and are seeing the emergence of new tendencies and movements.

A Democratic Platform has already been formed within the CPSU, and at Central Committee plenums there are many arguments which reflect this process. We wish to restore not monolithism, but unity within pluralism.

[Arnalte] In other East European countries, the communist parties have won very few votes when free elections were called. Could the same thing happen in the USSR in the future?

[Zagladin] Those countries have the same problems as ourselves, and must learn to resolve them. We were partly to blame for what happened. We proceeded from the principle that since we were the first, we did everything right and were the example to be followed—a model for the rest.

For that reason we shackled other countries. The clearest case is 1968. But we are not wholly to blame.

The ruling parties in socialist Europe followed us because they viewed us as having more experience and copied the same authoritarian administrative system as in our country.

For those who were in power, the system was very convenient. That is why the communist parties began to lose their authority among the people. They could have carried out their perestroyka, but they would not do so. When we started, they admired it, but they did not apply the conclusions, and so lost more authority among the people.

More parties will take part in elections in the USSR. The ecologists are a tendency which will become a very influential party.

We communists will contend for power in democratic competition with other parties; we must learn to work in coalitions, knowing that we will not have 100 percent.

In the local elections, the representatives put themselves forward from below. Over 80 percent have been elected by the people from among Communist Party members. The CPSU retains its influence, and we will try to strengthen it—but democratically.

[Arnalte] That is so in Russia, but what about in the other republics? Could there not be a chain reaction of secession from the USSR, following the example of Lithuania and Georgia?

[Zagladin] This problem is a result of the former policy. The ethnic problems have existed for centuries. The revolution declared that each republic was a sovereign state, but it did not turn out like that in practice. It was a formal sovereignty.

What is happening now is a reaction against this situation. The CPSU is now proposing a federal reform which will guarantee real sovereignty for each republic within the federation.

[Arnalte] What could happen if the republics do not wait for that reform?

[Zagladin] The Constitution says that each republic can leave the union, but there is no law to govern the secession mechanism. We are devising the procedure.

[Arnalte] What if a de facto secession occurs without any procedure?

[Zagladin] All the republics have recognized the Constitution. Until the situation is legalized, independence cannot be recognized. Moreover, they must pay compensation for the infrastructure. An agreement must be reached when we have the law, but everything will be done without authoritarianism, otherwise we could not call ourselves a civilized society.

[Arnalte] What is the message of perestroyka?

[Zagladin] The first message of perestroyka is that we do not insist that our example be followed. We no longer put forward models of society. The second is to seek new ways to make progress, which are democratization, democratization, and democratization. And the third is to try to secure peaceful international cooperation.

I believe that within 10 or 15 years we will be able to completely eliminate the military threat in the world. Cooperation will save the world. We must all do it together.

[Arnalte] The EC is prepared to help the Eastern bloc to extricate itself from the economic crisis, but that will be to the detriment of the aid for the Third World. Will the USSR continue to keep up its aid?

[Zagladin] The West will help because it wishes to lead the Eastern bloc countries toward its economy and its capitalist system. It is trying not to help those peoples, but to bind them to its system.

[Arnalte] In your opinion, what are the problems now confronting the world, now that the barriers seem to be disappearing?

[Zagladin] In our opinion, there are three major problems: The first is disarmament, the second is ecology, and then there is the Third World.

We will continue aid for the Third World, but the problem is whether it will be effective and contribute to development.

While all the countries in Europe are carrying out a rapid arms reduction process, the Third World countries are carrying out a stockpiling process. They are spending more on arms than the aid which they receive for development. [Zagladin ends]

During his visit to Madrid, Zagladin has arranged with the Health Ministry for Spain to receive an unspecified number of children affected by the Chernobyl catastrophe.

Nishanov Chairs Discussion on Meskhetian Turks

PM0304150390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Meeting at the Soviet of Nationalities"]

[Text] R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities has held a consultative meeting devoted to a discussion of the problems of the Meskhetian Turks. It was attended by leaders of a number of the country's republics and oblasts and also representatives that ethnic group. A thorough, businesslike exchange of opinions was held.

Lukyanov, Maslennikov Discuss Newspaper Coverage

PM0404131090 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 90 p 1

[D. Sabov report incorporating remarks by A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and A.A. Maslennikov, leader of the USSR president's press service: "What Are the People at the 'Top' Saying About Us?"]

[Text] A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet:

"The newspapers are very different," Anatoliy Ivanovich said when asked how Soviet journalists covered the work of the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the Third Supreme Soviet Session. "The PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA teams work in different ways. The 13 people—nominally, but actually three—from KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA work in different ways. I am watching them very carefully, and my initial impression was: That is not right! But it turns out that by raising a certain question from a certain viewpoint they were making it interesting for the young people, because you cannot approach this matter in the old way. Although there is such a thing as aggression, in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA as elsewhere."

A.A. Maslennikov, leader of the press service (press secretary) to the USSR president:

"The attention of the USSR president," Arkadiy Afrikanovich said, enumerating the measures adopted in the first 18 days of presidential rule in the USSR, "was also drawn to a particular instance that was described by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA on 24 March in the article 'Militia Highwaymen.' It was a question of a

grossly arbitrary act by Stavropol Kray militia workers who unlawfully confiscated five cows in calf from an inhabitant of a neighboring autonomous republic. In connection with this matter the president instructed General Prosecutor Sukharev and Internal Affairs Minister Bakatin carefully to study the case and adopt appropriate measures."

It seems that our country still has a long way to go before it reaches that serene time when newspapers will, as Karamzin put it, serve the "successes of reason"—that is, when they will be printed so that people can read them, not so that resolutions can be adopted on their basis. And we ourselves are far from seeking to achieve that. We, therefore, call upon our colleagues on foreign publications not to be very surprised if our president personally adopts a decision on a case of "unlawful confiscation of five cows in calf." In the present maelstrom of events and difficulties which we define by the term crisis and which require urgent intervention by the highest executive authority, this incident may be the most trivial, but it could also be the most important. It indicates that neither the first estate (the executive) nor the fourth estate (as the mass media are increasingly frequently described) has the right to disregard the individual.

But for the time being, let us report that according to our information, an investigation of the facts cited in the article has already begun. KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA expresses the hope that it will soon be able to write in its pages about measures adopted on the basis of the newspaper article and on the instructions of the country's president....

Leningrad's Solovyev Reinstated in CPSU

LD0404162290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1510 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Leningrad, 4 April (TASS)—TASS correspondent Nikolay Kondratenko reports:

Yuriy Solovyev, former first secretary of the Leningrad Oblast CPSU Committee, who was excluded from the party in February this year "for lack of modesty and violation of the standards of party ethics," has been reinstated in the CPSU. As a TASS correspondent was told today in the party's oblast committee, the decision was made at last Friday's oblast committee plenum in connection with numerous letters from communists, while bearing public opinion in mind.

The justification for excluding Yuriy Solovyev, who had already retired by then, was provided by material from a party control commission that had been investigating the circumstances around his acquisition of a used Mercedes car.

During a reexamination of the matter, those attending the plenum suggested to Yuriy Solovyev that he should return the car to the commission shop, to which he agreed.

Yuriy Solovyev headed the Leningrad party organization for four years and was also a candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. He resigned after his defeat in the elections for USSR people's deputies last year. Before his party career, Yuriy Solovyev had for over 20 years headed an underground railway construction administration and he has now returned to the building profession in one of the Leningrad firms.

In conversation with a TASS correspondent, Yuriy Solovyev described the decision to exclude him from the CPSU as "a monstrous injustice, a failing in a system that has always been a breeding ground for puppets."

The system is now, he thinks, undergoing radical changes. Various politicized organizations and informal associations are playing an increasingly noticeable part in sociopolitical life. "Specifically, I have long believed in the possibility of a multiparty system in Soviet society," Yuriy Solovyev said. "Let there be two or three parties, maybe even more. But it is important that they direct their activities toward creation rather than the desire for power. I regard the founding of the institution of the president as the optimum solution for changing the situation that has developed within the country."

His role as a retired official and pensioner does not oppress him, but as Solovyev acknowledges, he is finding it hard to become used to his new situation. "Dynamic activity and an active position in life are more in accord with my character, but life is life. I am trying my best to make use of my experience during this period of social and political development, which is hard for the country," the former party official said.

Presidential Council Series Profiles Aytmatov

LD0304223390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1750 GMT on 3 April carries an 18-minute program, noted as the first in a new series, "Who's Who in the Presidential Council." The Presidential Council member profiled is Chingiz Aytmatov, who also currently serves as editor in chief of the journal INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA.

After brief announcer-read biographical details, in which we are told that Chingiz Torekulovich Aytmatov was born in 1927, the son of a secretary of the Kirghiz Oblast Party Committee who fell victim to the cult of personality in 1937, the program takes the form of an interview with Aytmatov by correspondent Dmitriy Kiselev. The interview then begins:

Kiselev asks: "Chingiz Torekulovich, you are known as a writer with a worldwide reputation and now you are a politician in the highest echelon. What does this mean for you and why, generally, did it happen?"

Aytmatov answers: "What can I say? Of course I did not come to this decision all that simply. Of course I am not

a professional politician, I mean a professional politician. [as heard] First and foremost I am a man of letters, a writer. My interests are linked first and foremost with literature and the cultural sphere. Life is such, however, that we cannot now confine ourselves to our own deep pesonal interests. I, therefore, considered it to be my duty to respond to the president's invitation and to join his cabinet. I hope I will be able to be useful to him to the extent of my experience."

The interview continues with a discussion of the need for politicians, both professional and nonprofessional.

Kiselev asks: "Do you believe you will personally be able to exert a real influence on the decisions made in the Presidential Council under conditions where a good half of the people in the Presidential Council are members of the Politburo and, in general, are professional politicians?"

Aytmatov answers: "In my view the first sitting, our first meeting, gives me the possibility to express this thought, that I was not aware of any special position or any special standing there on the part of the members of the Politburo: We expressed ourselves on equal terms and I felt that in fact there was no difference between us on that occasion."

Kiselev asks: "Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev presented all 16 of you members of the Presidential Council as people who think like him, but by a law known to logic since the time of Aristotle if A equals B and B equals C, then A is equal to C. If you think the same way as Gorbachev and Gorbachev thinks the same way as Yarin, then you, too, think the same say as Yarin, according to this law of logic. I take Yarin only by way of example. Are you really like-minded people?"

Aytmatov answers: "To a certain extent I think this is how things are, but there of course circumstances which are much more complicated. Yes, we are like-minded people: In particular, if I am to speak about myself, I do indeed have great esteem for Gorbachev and value him very highly as a historical personality. This does not mean, however, that we are going to be asbolutely and unconditionally united in our understanding of the various processes and in the solution of the various issues. That's the first point. Each one of us, I think, is capable of expressing himself and influencing to the extent that he is convinced of his arguments and reasoning. One must not forget, however, the Presidential Council is a consultative body: The final decision, the final conclusions are made by the president himself and herein lies the whole meaning of this institution. I think, therefore, the president himself has to orientate himself and think out which advice to take when and for what reason, when he should prefer, so to speak, one opinion to another."

Kiselev asks: "Does this mean from now on you are already thinking of yourself as a member of the Presidential Council and that this will hamper you in speaking out independently and on our own, say, in the press on the various acute problems in our life?"

Aytmatov answers: "No, I do not have that complex, and I have said this about myself and my former convictions are evidence of the fact that I will express myself in the way my conscience prompts me on any question and any problem if it demands my personal, subjective, opinion, so to speak."

The interview is interrupted briefly at this point as an incident is recalled when in 1964 Aytmatov, on board an aircraft plunging to earth following engine failure, took command of the situation to restore order in place of panic until the engine was restarted. The interview continues:

Kiselev asks: "One of the latest appeals which you have signed—it has been published in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA—is a call for the cathedrals of the Kremlin to be returned to the Russian Orthodox Church. Is that how you still think?"

Aytmatov answers: "Yes, that is what I think, and I think this should be done, because things have to be returned to their original owners."

Kiselev asks: "Are you counting upon finding people who think the same way on this issue in the Presidential Council?"

Aytmatov answers: "I have not yet asked anyone about this, but I do not think there will be any particular disagreements between us, for some reason or other I am sure of this. I think that participation in the work of the Presidential Council will on the one hand help in some way to release, to make me more compact and concentrated in my life and in my work, because the Supreme Soviet and the commission I have headed hitherto, the Commission for the Development of Culture, Language, National and International Traditions and the Protection of Historic Monuments, this commission, on the one hand it is extremely interesting to work on it, but on the other hand there is an endless amount of work on it."

Aytmatov is then asked why he is not wearing a Supreme Soviet deputy's badge. He says it is simply because he is sitting in his office as editor of INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA and for no other reason. He is asked about points that he has made from the platform of the Supreme Soviet, about his view of socialism and its goals in terms of the achievement of a more perfect way of life. He speaks of the need to be open to everything that human culture has created and is creating. He speaks briefly about his literary works of the past and his continuing endeavors in creative writing.

Deputy Minister of Fish Industry Retires

LD2503154390 Kaliningrad Maritime Press Service in Russian 1530 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Text] By decision of the USSR Council of Ministers dated 12 [words indistinct] Aleksandr Nikitovich

Gulchenko, USSR deputy minister of the fish industry, has been released from his post in connection with his retirement.

Western Intelligence Seeking to 'Dismember' USSR

LD0404144890

[Editorial Report] Moscow in Portuguese to Portugal at 2000 GMT on 3 April broadcasts a nine-minute interview with Aleksandr (?Ovidyev), chief of the counterintelligence and security section of the Committee for State Security (KGB), on his department's work. Asserting that it is difficult to define what counterespionage is, he states that the "enemy" is Western espionage in the USSR seeking to obtain technical, military, scientific, political, and other information. Espionage has no rules, he adds. Despite the recent improvement in international relations, no country has abolished its secret services, he points out. Beside their interest in economic, state, military, and other spheres, Western secret services also seek to influence events in other countries, he states. Different methods are used, including the use of sympathizers to "impose on the Soviets the bourgeois interpretation of the concept of democracy and to do their utmost to discredit the CPSU" which was, as a matter of fact, the initiator of perestroyka. They try to "denigrate the history of the Soviet state" to destabilize the USSR, he adds. It would be "ingenuous" to suppose that everybody in the West desires a prosperous socialist USSR. "Attempts are being made to implant in the country an attractively packaged and political and ideological pluralism of an anti-socialist variety and broad deideologization." Anti-constitutional groups are supported morally and materially by these services, he claims. For example, he cites the University of Columbia, New York, as a place where nationalist Sajudis propaganda is shown. Western secret services are very interested in interethnic relations in the USSR: "They take advantage of the contradictions in this sphere, foment ethnic differences. Their ultimate objective is to dismember the USSR." Radio Liberty and Free Europe broadcast advice on how to act toward this aim. He mentions the example of the present situation in Lithuania where attempts are being made to reestablish a "bourgeois" regime.

USSR To Seek Interpol Membership in May

LD3003180990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1612 GMT 30 mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 30 Mar (TASS)—The Soviet Union intends to submit an official request to be accepted as a member of Interpol in May of this year. This was reported at a news conference held here today by Nikolay Demidov, deputy USSR minister of internal affairs. He reported that in this case, in accordance with the established procedure, the question of the USSR's entry to Interpol could be examined as early as the regular sitting of the organization's executive committee at the beginning of June, 1990.

Nikolay Demidov noted that the documents currently necessary for entry to Interpol, drafted by the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, are being examined by the country's Council of Ministers. In addition, work of an organizational and cadre character continues, connected with the forthcoming entry to Interpol.

The representative of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs also reported that it is intended to set up the national bureau of Interpol in the USSR within the structure of the country's Criminal Investigation Department.

Peasantry Rejects Undermining of CPSU

PM0404125990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[Ivan Vasilyev "Publicist's Reflections": "Like Cures Like"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] There is **no** other force in society **apart from the CPSU** that is capable of understanding the fundamental needs of the countryside, because you cannot meet these needs alone, but only **in alliance** with the working class. At the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies the agrarian deputies talked excitedly about the need to have their own organization, but have not yet found an answer to the question: What will it be—a party or an alliance? If a "party," then it would be necessary to leave the CPSU; if an "alliance," then, apparently, it would not be necessary. In my view, the deputies' doubts are influenced by the position of the peasantry, which finds expression in total confidence in the party. Let no one think this strange: The class that suffered more than any other as a result of the party's course of depeasantization believes in its renewal and the correction of mistakes and does not believe other political forces, who are promising a "new" social system. The servilely apathetic, in the view of the "radicals," countryside can see very well what kind of forces they are and knows what their aspirations are.

To all appearances, a general front of so-called "perestroyka forces" is taking shape in attacks on the CPSU as the main stronghold of socialism. The countryside also reads the newspapers and soberly and very accurately assesses the direction of the main strike.

"Recent party plenums convincingly demonstrate that the leaders of perestroyka must be immediately removed from traditional CPSU control. Anyone who opposes this, even for the most democratic reasons, is jeopardizing our embryonic democracy." (Andrey Nuykin. IZVESTIYA, 13 March 1990).

"It is time also to disband the 'apparatus' creative unions, which are the focus for the leadership of 'tunnel-vision' art.... Would it not be better for people's deputies to take power into their—democratic—hands there, too, and release a number of leading press organs from their

'apparatus' founders, thus establishing real freedom of expression and of the press?!" [M. Kapustin. NEDELYA, No 9, 1990).

"...It seems to me that here, too, we need to adopt a norm that would mean that the activity of all primary political organizations is banned at state... enterprises and in institutions.... There are institutions in our country where it is not enough to talk simply about the primary organizations. The point is, it seems to me, that employees of these institutions cannot be in a political party anyway. I am talking about our army, about the law-enforcement organs, the security organs, the militia... a legislative decision must be taken to the effect that officers and men of the army, state security, internal forces, and militia and personnel of the law-enforcement organs do not have the right to be in any political party." (G. Popov. From a speech at the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies).

These, as you can see, are clearly defined directions of attack:

—**remove** the leaders of perestroyka from CPSU control, that is, decapitate the force that started and is leading perestroyka;

—disband the creative unions and take over the press organs, that is, **cut away** the party's loyal creative intelligentsia and deprive it of the means of ideological and organizing influence;

—prohibit servicemen and law-enforcement personnel from **being members** of the party and prohibit party organizations in production and in institutions, which means the dispersal of communists from the Army and from plants and kolkhozes to domestic kitchens and social clubs.

If this is not a policy of total destruction of the CPSU, what is it? As we can see, publicists, philosophers, and people's deputies—all of whom have true communists standing in their way to power—are united to that end. But the curious thing is that for some reason none of these forces opposing the CPSU are in a hurry to call themselves parties and their ideologists prefer to carry CPSU cards in their pockets. The purpose is obvious, it seems to me, and it has been demonstrated in Lithuania—to **demoralize** and **split** the party from within and seize its property, without leaving the CPSU and without revealing their true intentions for the time being.

It is not difficult announcing the creation of a party, but what resources is it going to use? "Underground" resources or resources from "centers" of some kind? But this would mean casting off the mask and revealing the true face—the masses would realize right away. Is it not better to seize such wealth and such facilities, established by communists over nearly a century, ready-made? In that case, are not our "democrats" similar to the members of the infamous "committees of poor peasants": confiscate, destroy, and redistribute? Perhaps they are.

But where did it come from, more than 50 years on? It has to be admitted that it is the party's cancer. For many, many years time-servers and rogues have been creeping under the "umbrella" of the "sole, leading" party, changing their guise, adapting, and flourishing, while defaming, ousting, and suppressing healthy, truly Leninist, labor forces, and now, they believe, the day of reckoning has come, they have swiftly changed masks, whipped on their "democratic" clothes, and launched a determined attack in the guise of perestroyka. What do they care about the fact that the party has begun its agonizing renewal? Don't let it do it, don't let it get rid of the fellow-travelers and rogues, destroy it as soon as possible, and banish it to the backwoods of political life.

So the countryside smelled a rat and started to wake up fast. This awakening was inevitably detected by the agrarian deputies who were doubtful whether it would be advisable to set up a special peasant party, since such a step would be tantamount to driving a fat wedge between the working class and the peasantry. It was sensed by the Leningrad workers, who called for an **Initiatory Congress of Russian Communists**, rightly seeing the creation of a Russian Communist Party as a way to **preserve the CPSU's integrity**. No matter how much "democrats" of all hues holler about apparatus games, they will not deceive the masses. The Russian provinces—workers and peasants—occupy a firm position of confidence in the party, the need for its renewal, and the cohesion of all healthy forces in society on the path to people's power. This is graphically confirmed by the local press, which reflects the precongress debate in the countryside. The confidence is also demonstrated by the fact that local soviet deputies, who only recently were against combining posts, are now electing party leaders as the top people in soviets right, left, and center. When the party was faced with a **real threat** the peasants put aside their arguments and grievances and leapt to its defense.

This turn of events does not suit our "democrats" and they are pinning all kinds of labels of workers and peasants. TRIBUNA, bulletin of Sverdlovsk Youth Scientific-Technical Creativity, published Yu. Afanasyev's speech at the Estonian Social Democratic Association Congress: "The right-wing bloc can expect its social base to be replenished by workers and rural inhabitants, by people who over a period of 72 years have become dependent on the state and whom it has on a "short leash." Expecting minor improvements and tidbits from on high, these people are reluctant to take a risk and they have become unaccustomed to "living dangerously." Recent events... show that certain archaic, little studied behavioral stereotypes are undergoing a revival."

You can see what is happening according to Afanasyev: The working people who create all the material benefits are parasites, they are little dogs on short leads, waiting for tidbits from on high and reluctant to "live dangerously" in expectation of a farmhand's lot. If one holds that view of the people how can one understand their "behavioral stereotypes." If scientists like Afanasyev were to stop categorizing the people's behavior as "little

studied" and get down to some proper scientific study, they would see that it expresses the fundamental interests of working people—the **right to organize their own lives**, without "democratic" instructors and guides.

Where these guides lead one is evident from the following dialogue. A wealthy intellectual cooperative member, who has probably managed to make a crafty million, asked a kolkhoz [collective farm] chairman:

"How are things with you, are the peasants intending to take over ownership of the land?"

"There have been no applications yet."

"They don't want to take the risk, is that it? I will, though. Will you give me land?"

"But you don't know how to work it."

"Yes, but I do know how to organize."

"And what kind of organization do you have in mind?"

"What I will do is get signed documents from the peasants, saying that they are relinquishing the land, and I will ask the soviet to transfer the land to me. I will be the owner and I will hire the peasants."

"As farmhands?"

"What of it? Does it matter to them where they work: For you or for me."

It might not matter to the new breed of landowner, but it does to the peasant: Whether he plows his own, kolkhoz land or some lord's land; whether he organizes his own life or depend's on the new lord's charity. This answers the question about a "little studied behavioral stereotype"—the peasant can see very well what path to take if he wants to organize his own life and what path leads to destruction. So the radical programs of the new breed of Social Democrats, Kadets [prerevolutionary constitutional democrats], christian democratic socialists [khedeesovtsy], and other "left-wingers" are hardly likely to win over the countryside; the peasant can still know a "wolf in sheep's clothing" when he sees one. Despite the many contradictions between city and countryside, the latter can see that they can only be eliminated by having the closest possible alliance between the working class and the peasantry, whose renewal and strengthening is the aim of the Communist Party, as it purges itself; therefore, it remains in the consciousness of working people the leading force of society.

Commentary on Informal Organizations

18120113A Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 7, 25 Feb-4 Mar 90 p 8

[Materials prepared by the MOSCOW NEWS Center for Political and Legal Studies and Information: "Mass Movements in the 1990's"]

[Text] **Scholars' View: Inevitability of Partnership**

Competing with official structures and gathering momentum, the mass movements have developed new relations vis-a-vis the authorities. Whereas last year the "unofficial movements" were not taken seriously, today the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee has spoken out for cooperation and dialogue with them. By exposing the problems that still exist, despite the reforms, and by raising public awareness, the unofficial movements have reduced the authorities' credibility and prompted them to make quicker, better decisions. Where the year 1989 was a year of questions, 1990 is becoming a year of decisions. Hopefully, quite drastic decisions will be made about ownership, land, political freedoms, the role of the Party and self-management.

The forthcoming elections are to become the catalyst in the process. Participation in the election campaign will give the public movements an opportunity to legitimately get involved in the official power structures. Each unofficial group, by supporting its candidate, will be able to legally act within the framework of local government and legislature, using the system's institutions, instead of picketing them.

Using their deputies as mouthpieces, the mass movements will have the chance to put forward their demands not only at public rallies, but also in local Soviets and the Supreme Soviet of Union Republics. Rallying around independent deputies will be energetic activists from among the broad public who will be able to take part in and control the carrying out of the proposed decisions. Even those who will not be represented in the elected power structures will no longer experience the information vacuum. The authorities will no longer be able to pretend not to hear or understand the demands coming from the public. This will give rise to the dialogue between the public movements and the state, something natural for a democratic society. The two will cooperate as partners.

Once samizdat publications are legalized by the Law on the Press, they are bound to democratize the official press without undermining it. *Nina Belyayeva, lawyer; Vladimir Pastukhov, politologist*

Insiders' View: Rising on the Crest of a New Wave

The independent democratic movement in the USSR has revealed its surging structure. Each new wave is born with the firm conviction that it is the first of its kind. Each new surge strives to be joyful, fresh and decisive. But instead, they all repeat the same pattern, and only add some new qualities. What is the difference between the successive waves?

First of all, each successive swell forces "new politicians" to get involved in the life of the surrounding society. Earlier, dissidents were often called "outcasts" by the radio and the press. There was some truth in that. Indeed, they lived with their own visions rather than those of the surrounding world.

While the "unofficial" groups are no longer outcasts, they are still outsiders. While they live their own lives, under certain conditions they are quite capable of finding a common language with "the people" (as happened repeatedly at public rallies).

The representatives of the "third wave" in the public movements (who are often called "the unofficials" by analogy and resent the name) are perfectly well-rounded individuals, and well integrated in society. They go to work, and live, as ordinary Soviet citizens do, at home—not at noisy meetings (as is the habit of "the unofficials"), or in prison (as happened with the dissidents).

The prospect for broadening the movements' potential by their taking part in election campaigns is becoming quite realistic.

The new political and party system being built feels an acute shortage of middle-ranking politicians. There are masses presumably happy to be led somewhere. There are "big shots" ready to show the way. But between the "head" and the "feet" a "spine" must form during the election-90.

We believe that, at the moment, there are two serious potential sources for the future political structures: the democratic-socialist-populist movement (represented by the inter-regional group comprising deputies, the left-radical wing of the CPSU, the regional popular fronts, and clubs of electors), and the conservative movement (the conservative wing of the CPSU, the Working People's United Front, Otechestvo, Pamyat, a group of deputies and electors calling themselves Russia).

When the elections are over, the result will be at least two opposition coalitions—loose yet real, not quite fit to be called parties.

The future political stability of perestroyka will, to a great extent, depend on whether or not today's liberal leaders of the CPSU "centre" will be able to find a common language with the new politicians and political forces.

What about the prospects for a free, uncensured press? Is it going to survive the new Law on the Press?

Supposedly, about half of the existing publications (of which in the Russian language alone there are more than 700!) will successfully register in keeping with the Law and continue to exist in the same information niche they occupy today. They might increase their circulation by reducing the price and improving the typographic quality. Provincial journalists will face the problem of drastically improving their professionalism and expanding their information base, in order to remain competitive.

Literary and political samizdat will face powerful competition from the cooperative press. Offering better pay and not particularly choosy in their search for commercial success, cooperative publications are welling up fast. As distinct from samizdat, the cooperative press is being distributed by the state-run distributors Soyuzpechat. In the year to come we expect the state-subsidized publications to suffer a certain braindrain, with employees leaving for the commercial press. With employees who are more individualistic, samizdat is less likely to be affected. *Ilya Kudryavtsev, Moscow Information Exchange Bureau; Alexander Suetnov, editor of "Independent Bibliographer"*

A Multi-Party Future

The Popular Front has no rigid organizational structure and its members are anyone who wants to take part in perestroyka, in active political life. The Popular Front is a form of politization of working people within perestroyka. The Popular Front is also a feedback between the masses and the government.

The example of the Baltic Republics has shown that a Popular Front creates the necessary conditions for a multi-party system, makes it possible to form a single coalition out of a multitude of parties, and to cooperate within the framework of a united people's movement. It is now already clear that the future of our country lies with this kind of system and I think it is the task of the Popular Front to create a model for a confederation of parties by uniting different social forces.

Many of the delegates who are actively working now were nominated and supported by the Popular Fronts at the elections. *Igor Shamshev, USSR people's deputy, leader of the Yaroslavl Popular Front*

'Power to Soviets, and Not to the Parties'

A multi-party parliamentary republic is the main demand consistent within a democratic system for the majority of representatives of today's political movement. The anarchists are for a non-party, stateless system of society. Historical experience has shown us that a political party as an institution most often degenerates into a centralized organization whose leaders fight for power or for the transformation of spheres of influence in society. The people only have to vote for the leaders proposed by their parties. The only guarantee against this is the development of broad-scale popular movements and a consistent orientation towards elected local self-government. Society should be federal and the means of production should be owned by cells of this federation, by self-governed communities.

The Moscow chapter of the Confederation has developed from a Marxist club to an organization which completely rejects the idea of statehood. We understand that it is impossible to make the transfer all at once; we must patiently build up self-governing local patterns, that's why anarchists took part in the elections under the slogan—"Power to Soviets, and Not to the Parties!" With developed non-party social movements constantly active local Soviets might actually prove to be the uniting element of local self-government. *Andrei Isayev, leader, Confederation of Anarcho-Syndicalists*

Consolidation—The Struggle Against Stratification

The OFT [Working People's United Front] is an alliance of many, many independent associations involved in production, all concerned about our country's destiny. In particular their concern is for the man who does an honest day's work, who lives on his earnings and loses his feeling of social protection.

The new economic concept, whilst leading to greater social stratification, to the enrichment of some enterprises and to bankruptcy for others, will increase the numbers of work collectives which will come to us for support in their battle for social justice. At first perestroyka achieved success mainly in the ministries, whilst chaos reigned in production—the standard of living of workers is falling sharply along with that of the man on the street.

We now have a situation new to socialism—private childcare—private dancing and music lessons, children's sports private clubs. We are ready to accept private health protection and private property. But is all this accessible to those who live on their wages? How can a working man afford private property? That's where the movement started: What has happened to perestroika right now? The Party—city and regional Party committees—lagged behind in making positive initiatives. The people have eagerly seized on new ideas whilst their powers of implementation—to take the Party committees as an example—are lagging behind. The role of the trade unions is also far from clear—they don't offer any help or positive initiatives, we have to cope by ourselves. But we're prepared to cooperate with everybody, with any public movement or organization, even with a leader from the apparat. We're already fed up with the label "apparatchik"—we know that there are honest people loyal to perestroyka working in the apparat.

The future of our movement is clear—more and more people will join and eventually sort things out for themselves. I believe in the common sense of the people, in the wisdom of the working man. *Veniamin Yarin, USSR people's deputy, Co-Chairman of the OFT Council*

Variety and Pluralism

The present workers movement is based on two main levels of consciousness, arising from empty shelves in the shops and from concern as to whether there will be a connection between inflation and wages, i.e., are the workers struggling only for today's well-being, or are they fundamentally concerned with their status and role in the country.

When we call ourselves an independent movement we separate ourselves from the OFT. They are not our enemies of course, it is just that they adhere to old ideological positions—one type of consciousness, one Party, one type of ownership. Our movement is trying to free the working consciousness from the dogma of monopoly: It must be independent of ideology. We are working to protect the workers' interests—a problem existing under all parties.

Although any strike now inevitably becomes political, this is not an aim in itself but rather an inevitability until we have been able to build a varied economic and political life. That's why the essence of our differences with the OFT is very simple—should we recognize more than one party and more than one political stance, or not?

Strike committees are an independent phenomenon in the workers movement. In some of the strike committees the OFT has more influence (Kuzbas), and in others we do (Vorkuta). The committees are not dissolved after a strike has ended, they become permanent self-governing bodies. What is important today in the growing workers movement is not its size, but its doctrine—what will the future hold for us. *Kazimieras Uoka, USSR people's deputy, chairman of the Union of Workers of Lithuania —part of the independent workers movement*

Agrarian Union Congress To Convene 26 April

PM0504125390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "On Russian Agrarian Congress"]

[Text] A session of the organizing committee to prepare for the All-Russian Agrarian Congress was held yesterday on the initiative of the All-Russian Kolkhoz [Collective Farm] Council and the State Agro-Industrial Committees of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and the Non-Chernozem Zone of the RSFSR. The sitting decided to convene the congress in Moscow City 26 April this year, and there to form the Russian Agrarian Union, elect the union's council, and also adopt its program and statutes. Commissions were formed to prepare the congress documents. Norms were defined for the representation of agrarian congress delegates, who will be elected on a broad democratic basis in oblasts, krays, and autonomous republics. Representatives of kolkhozes [collective farms], state farms, cooperatives, lessees, peasant farms, processing and food enterprises, science, agro-industrial formations, and other organizations will participate in the congress.

Supeme Court Plenum Discusses Bribery, Speculation

LD0304214690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1722 GMT 3 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 3 Apr (TASS)—A routine plenum of the USSR Supreme Court has taken place.

In connection with the growth in the number of crimes for gain, which is continuing within the country (in 1989 they accounted for over half of the overall number), the plenum discussed the state of judicial practice in cases of bribery, speculation and abuses of office.

In a decision on cases of bribery, the plenum emphasized that the danger of bribery is increasing. Since it is a form of money-grubbing behavior, preying parasitically on the work of state, economic, and public institutions and organiztions, bribery is, moreover, frequently linked with theft, abuses of office, speculation and other crimes for gain.

After analyzing judicial practice in cases of speculation, the plenum noted that, despite the growth in the numbers of these crimes and their negative effect on the socioeconomic situation and on the provision of goods to the population, many persons guilty of speculation go unnoticed by the law-enforcement bodies and avoid being brought to book.

In this connection, courts have been instructed to step up their demands on the bodies conducting inquiries and preliminary investigations so as to bring those guilty of speculation to account.

The courts' attention has been drawn to the impermissibility of any indulgence when punishing hardened speculators, the organizers and participants in group speculation, or persons who have engaged in particularly large-scale speculation. Moreover, the laws' requirements concerning the confiscation of the property of guilty persons and the appropriation by the state of money and valuables acquired by criminal means must be stringently observed.

The plenum considered the protests by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court and the USSR procurator general over judicial cases, including those against a large number of persons who were subjected to unjustified repression in the thirties, forties and early fifties. All these persons have been rehabilitated.

The plenum instructed the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court to send to the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic a statement about the preventing of Misyunas, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme court, who is an ex officio member of the USSR Supreme Court, from taking part in the plenum's work.

Charitable Association Formed, Statutes Adopted

PM0404143690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 2

[T. Khudyakova report: "'Humanism and Charity'"]

[Text] This is the name of an all-union association, formed on the initiative of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems.

The constituent conference which took place 31 March adopted statutes, elected a board, and determined the basic directions of activity. Among the founder members were central USSR departments, social organizations, foundations, unions, newspaper editorial boards, religious organizations, banks, and enterprises.

Today the forming of an association is a common phenomenon of our life, but the newly formed association is distinguished by one peculiarity. The main direction of its activity is to coordinate the efforts of people engaged in charitable works.

It is above all a question of defining more specifically the people toward whom charity is addressed. A special sociological service will be established which will form a data bank and collate the hitherto uncoordinated and not always reliable statistics.

Both the statutes and the program of the association already define to whom help will be offered. They will include very old people living on their own, large families, invalids, and servicemen's families. In a word, all those who today are experiencing acute necessity, and whose lives will in the not so distant future become considerably more difficult in connection with the transition of the country's economy to market relations. Those most in need of social protection.

In addition to coordinating and consultative work, the association aims to conduct autonomous economic activity, forming enterprises on cooperative principles with other charitable organizations and foundations, state enterprises, and cooperatives. A decision was adopted on publishing the association's own journal, SOTSIALNAYA ZASHCHITA [SOCIAL PROTECTION].

To avoid creating an administrative apparatus, the existing structures of the Soviet Charity and Health Foundation, branches of the Union of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and other organizations will be used for work in the localities. The association secretariat will consist of only seven people. The USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems will take on the responsibility for its running costs.

All the financial resources which enter the account of the association from its founder members and from donors and the profits of the newly created enterprises will go toward charitable ends only.

Reader Backs SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's Views

PM0404101990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Apr 90 Second Edition p 3

[Letter from Olga Valentinovna Bulgakova (Ponomareva): "'Things Aren't All That Bad in Russia'"]

[Excerpt] Esteemed comrade editor!

People's Deputy A.A. Sobchak vehemently attacked SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 March on Leningrad Telesivion, even describing it as a "reactionary" newspaper. He cited the publication of the article by Nina Andreyevna and "certain other materials" (I don't know which) as proof of this conclusion. I believe that, on the contrary, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA has thus demonstrated the breadth of its views and its objectivity: After all, Nina Andreyevna's "particular opinion" ultimately

only boiled down to the fact that all our past should not be effaced, there was a great deal of good in it which can and must be taken on board today. Would a reasonable unbiased person really dispute this?

I personally find SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's articles extremely interesting, diverse, and—and this is the main thing—useful, since the authors of its articles nearly always speak about the specific things needed to develop and deepen perestroyka. And that is the main thing now.

As for the interregional group of people's deputies, of which A.A. Sobchak is also a member, their statements often arouse perplexity. You find yourself remembering the American proverb "with friends like that who needs enemies" cited in the article by American journalist Michael Davidow, which was also printed in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA (4 March 1990). I would like all people's deputies, since they are "people's" deputies to engage in constructive activity and concrete actions to improve the people's life—which is what everyone expects now—rather than striving to satisfy their own ambitions. [passage omitted].

[Signed] Olga Valentinovna Bulgakova (Ponomareva).

Economic

Conversion of Semipalatinsk Test Site Urged

PM0404111990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Apr 90 First Edition p 2

[Colonel A. Ladin interview with Kurchatov nuclear experts under the rubric "Focus on a Problem": "Nuclear Test Site and Conversion"—date of interviews not given]

[Text] There is heightened interest in the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site at the moment. Should nuclear explosions be carried out here or should the test site be moved to Novaya Zemlya—this is a question which is currently being discussed by various commissions, Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] scientists and public figures, the Ministry of Defense, the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions, the Committee for Questions of Ecology and Rational Use of Natural Resources, and the country's government... Careful expert assessments are needed before a final decision is made. This decision is being awaited with hope and trepidation by the inhabitants of Semipalatinsk and neighboring oblasts. And how do people who are directly connected with the work of the test site see its future?

A few days ago a delegation from Semipalatinsk Oblast's Kurchatov city visited Alma-Ata. I must explain for the uninitiated reader: Kurchatov is the now no longer secret city of the nuclear test site workers. It has a working population of some 12,000 people, its own party gorkom [city committee] and its own Soviet of People's Deputies. The chairman of the gorispolkom [soviet executive committee] is Yevgeniy Vladimirovich Chaykovskiy. He headed the city's delegation at a meeting with the leadership and aktiv of the "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" public movement.

After the meeting I talked with Ye. Chaykovskiy and also Candidate of Technical Sciences Colonel Lev Leontyevich Nefedov, city soviet deputy, and Candidate of Technical Sciences Boris Vladimirovich Sorokin, party gorkom member and staffer of a science-and-production association joint expedition. Candidate of Physical and Mathematical Sciences Igor Valentinovich Kazachevskiy, head of a laboratory of the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences Nuclear Physics Institute, also took part in the conversation.

Ye. Chaykovskiy: Living and working in Kurchatov, where apart from the personnel directly employed at the test site quite a few other professions are also represented, has become increasingly uncomfortable of late. First, there is the mounting public pressure to end nuclear tests and, second, there are our internal problems which are growing more and more acute, above all those which are connected with the shortage of housing, children's and school establishments, jobs, food, and consumer goods.

The situation is further exacerbated as a result of the fact that a number of the site personnel previously involved in carrying out the tests are now out of work. Many of them are planning to leave the city. That means that we will lose the best scientific cadres. People are also leaving the city because at various rallies a barrage of irresponsible threats has been launched against our people. Who can put up with that? If everything that is being done at the test site is totally useless, as is being claimed at the rallies, why put up with deprivation and adversity? But if the work of the Kurchatov test cite workers is nonetheless needed by the people, as is actually the case, then all those who are carrying out experimental research work at the test site or providing the backup must be able to lead normal human lives and have the necessary preconditions for scientific work and normal living conditions.

Correspondent: Have you raised these questions with anyone?

Ye. Chaykovskiy: Yes, at the last session of the city soviet an appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet was adopted. USSR People's Deputy Colonel N. Petrushenko submitted it to the appropriate commission. This appeal also contains our proposals for the conversion of the test site.

Correspondent: What worries you most of all?

Ye. Chaykovskiy: The situation around the test site is such that the continuation of the tests appears to be out of question. The city soviet has proposed to the government that it declare another moratorium on nuclear explosions and embark on conversion of the test site.

Correspondent: So you favor a moratorium. And then?

Ye. Sorokin: We have serious proposals for reorienting the scientific laboratories and test site production facilities to the study of various national economic tasks and peaceful research. The situation at rallies has deteriorated to such extent that certain hotheads are suggesting that bulldozers be used to raze the site to the ground, without knowing what there is and what benefit the scientific base valued at billions of rubles could produce.

Correspondent: Maybe more information should be provided about work at the test site and its personnel. After all, it is not just explosions which are carried out there.

L. Nefedov: Of late our specialists have been frequently visiting the inhabitants of the surrounding population centers and meeting with Semipalatinsk working people. It is true that the preparation and implementation of underground nuclear tests account for only 30 percent of the total volume of scientific research carried out at the test site. Work in the interests of many ministries and departments is being carried out. For instance, the day after the tragedy in Chernobyl our specialists flew to the site of the accident. In all, some 50 people were there at various times. A system for monitoring changes in the concentration of aerosols in the near-earth layer of the atmosphere, developed by scientists at the test site, has been used at Chernobyl. Around the Chernobyl AES [nuclear electric power station] some 1,500 monitoring devices developed by scientists at the test site are currently in use. A major contribution to the elimination of the consequences of the accident was made by such specialists as Colonel N. Terekhov, Lieutenant Colonel S. Smagulov and A. Ilyash, and many others.

Correspondent: The more people know about work at the test site, the less frightened they will be and the less likely to believe rumors...

B. Sorokin: Naturally. This is why we have decided to initiate members of the leadership of the "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" public movement into some of our plans. For instance, Ye. Chakovskiy recently had a conversation in Moscow with USSR People's Deputy O. Suleymenov. Now our delegation has taken part in Alma-Ata in an enlarged session of the coordinating committee of this public organization. We read out our appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet there. In addition, meetings with a number of scientists from the Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences have been held. Cooperation contracts are being concluded.

Correspondent: You mentioned the conversion of the test site. Could you tell us in greater detail what the leadership and the collective of the test site are intending to do with a view to reorientating their activity?

L. Nefedov: The experience accumulated at the test cite is essential not just for defense purposes. For instance, some 120 explosions have been carried out in the country in the interests of the national economy. Low-yield nuclear explosions have been used to extinguish major fires and also to relieve pressure in seams to assist miners. Scientists from Armenia used the facilities of the test site for a number of years to test structures' earthquake resistance. However, subsequently they discontinued their research. Kazakh scientists, on the other hand, are planning to conduct large-scale tests of new earthquake-resistant structures with our help. Japanese scientists are also interested in this work. We are able to create at the test site local conditions which closely simulate a real earthquake, both with the help of nuclear charges and with the use of conventional explosives.

B. Sorokin: At present research with a view to enhancing the safety of nuclear power stations is being conducted at the test site. It is necessary to take a realistic view of the future: No matter what anybody says, we will not be able to manage without nuclear power stations and without nuclear power engineering. While in our country people are still arguing about whether AES's should be built or not, abroad people are thinking about something else—how to enhance the safety of nuclear power generation installations. To give you an example, let me tell you that in France nuclear power stations produce 70 percent of all electricity, in the FRG 30 percent, and in Japan, which has experienced the horror of the nuclear holocaust, nuclear power stations supply 25 percent of electricity. In the Soviet Union they account for only 12 percent of electricity output. We cannot stand still in the development of nuclear power engineering. We are proposing that the scientific base of the test site be utilized and an experimental research center be set up there to investigate nuclear power engineering installation safety problems...

I. Kazachevskiy: All the preconditions for intensive research in the sphere of physics and technical sciences exist at the test site. I would like to say that our academic institute is interested in cooperation with the scientists at the test site with a view to developing the latest technologies for the production of superpure metals. As is known, these are needed in various sectors of industry, and especially the electronics industry.

B. Sorokin: We are not just talking about conversion, to some extent we are already working on it. For instance, computer technology and automation experts have concluded a contract with the ferroalloy plant in Yermak (Kazakh SSR) for the development of an automated control system for technological processes and also a diagnostic system to monitor processes taking place in smelting furnaces. The cost of this work totals R1 million. A package of applied programs is being compiled for the Irtysh Shipping Line which will make it possible to optimize shipping schedules, establish order in the settlement of accounts with clients, and automate the compilation of all kinds of documentation.

Our production facilities are supplying various enterprises and medical establishments in Semipalatinsk Oblast with liquid nitrogen and liquid and gas oxygen. Sprinkling equipment is being repaired in our workshops. Cooperation is being developed with the "Altayzoloto" mining and enrichment combine.

Ye. Chaykovskiy: There are also other examples. For instance, the provision of all kind of consumer services for the population of Semipalatinsk Oblast has already been organized in our production subdivisions. Reconstruction of workshops is under way and when it is completed we will start producing assemblies and components for the dairy, canning, and wine-making industry. In our carpentry shops production of school furniture is being organized. The oblast is providing the timber.

The city soviet is taking steps to transform Kurchatov into an increasingly modern major scientific center. However, as yet we have many problems.

We firmly believe that all departments in whose interests the test site's scientific base is being use must make their contribution to the provision of amenities in the city and the construction of housing and sociocultural and medical facilities.

We are deeply concerned for the future of Kurchatov, our city, and our entire region. We want to draw attention to our problems in good time. We have raised the question of the test site's conversion because we are aware that this process must take place on the basis of precise computations and plans. We believe that conversion could be of considerable benefit both for the republic and the country as a whole.

Il-114 Passenger Aircraft Completes Test Flight

PM0404100390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 7

[Own correspondent R. Ignatyev report: "Il-114 Flight Tests Begin"]

[Text] The new Il-114 passenger aircraft made its maiden flight from the Zhukovskiy Airfield near Moscow at 1600 hours on 29 March. IZVESTIYA's correspondent asked A. Shakhnovich, chief of the S. Ilyushin Experimental Design Bureau, to comment on the details of this event.

This is the latest aircraft from our design bureau's famous family of planes. The new aircraft is designed to carry 60-64 passengers up to 1,000 km. Its speed is 500-550 km per hour, and its cruising altitude up to 8,100 meters. The Il-114 will be used in the most varied geographical conditions, mainly on local routes. It can be used on both concrete and unpaved airfields.

The main difference between the Il-114 and similar previous-generation aircraft is its lower fuel burn (almost half as much). This fuel consumption figure is achieved by using economical engines, sophisticated aerodynamics, and other design advances.

The aircraft has two state-of-the-art six-propellor engines. Each develops 2,500 horsepower. The aircraft weighs 21 tonnes. The model is suitable for work in the Arctic, Antarctic, and far north. The Il-114 needs a relatively small area for take-off and landing. The aircraft's take-off run is just 1,000 meters.

The new airliner meets all modern demands. Its exterior is covered with polyurethane enamels. They are not only attractive, they protect the aircraft from the effect of the environment. The Il-114 is comfortable. The cabin interior uses light fiberglass structures and three-layer polymer honeycomb panels. The new seat design is very comfortable.

The passenger cabin has additional baggage compartments and individual lighting. The air conditioning system provides for the circulation of fresh air.

There is a two-seat cockpit. It is equipped with digital avionics—that is, it has display screens instead of numerous analog instruments. There are five screens. The electronics monitor and record the performance of on-board equipment and possible breakdowns. The piloting and navigation systems are backed up by an automated management system which makes all kinds of measurements and forewarns of any dangerous conditions. In order to cut noise levels electronic regulators have been installed in the cockpit to synchronize the propellor blades' revolution rate.

The first aircraft has been planned and built under the leadership of General Designer Academician G. Novozhilov in close cooperation with the Tashkent Aircraft Association and other institutes and organizations. The aircraft has now entered series production at the Tashkent plant.

The test flight at the Zhukovskiy Airfield near Moscow lasted 30 minutes and went successfully. The aircraft was flown by a crew headed by Meritorious Test Pilot V. Belousov.

Il-114 testing should be complete by 1991, after which it will be commissioned by Aeroflot. It will be used in areas where the well-known but obsolete An-24 and Il-14 are currently used. They will gradually be replaced by the modern Il-114.

I would add that the new aircraft accords with the strictest international flight safety requirements. The S. Ilyushin Design Bureau under the leadership of General Designer Academician G. Novozhilov is continuing its work on the development of the Il-114 project. In particular, the task has been set of increasing its range. In time this aircraft will carry more passengers (compared with its current capacity).

Chief Designer Interviewed

PM0404151690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Second Edition p 1

[Special correspondent V. Chebakov report including interview with USSR People's Deputy Genrikh Vasilyevich Novozhilov, chief designer at the Ilyushin Special Design Bureau, after first flight of Il-114 plane at Zhukovskiy on 29 March: "An Airplane Is Born"]

[Excerpts] Zhukovskiy City, Moscow Oblast—[passage omitted]

[Chebakov] Genrikh Vasilyevich, the Il-96-300, the most modern and largest homegrown passenger airplane, took to the air less than two years ago. Today the small Il-114 took to the air. But they are both so necessary to our Aeroflot. For the country is disastrously short of aircraft.

[Novozhilov] And the shortage will continue. Because on orders from above, the plane builders have started to engage in functions which are not their speciality, under the conversion plan. Instead of the defense complex forces concentrating on building passenger aircraft to meet the needs of Soviet citizens, aerodynamics, fuselage, and undercarriage specialists have to design machines for dressing hides and making pasta. [Novozhilov ends]

The first flight is the first step. Ahead of the designers and testers lies much intensive work to ensure that the Il-114 makes a timely appearance on the country's airline routes.

Military

Article Examines Need for Military Reform

PM2803121090 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No. 12, 20-26 Mar 90 p 30-31

[Major General Yuriy Kirshin article: "Why Is Military Reform Needed?"]

[Text] Our defence system is in need of radical improvement. In a new situation, and with new objectives facing us, we cannot do without an all-embracing army reform. Individual measures being taken are of undeniable importance and raise our defence effort to a qualitatively new level. Many of them, however, are superficial and do not go far enough. It is important to emphasize that for all the effectiveness of these measures, they do not as yet constitute an integral conceptual whole.

Defence systems: decision making

We know from history that army reforms have always been carried out at turning points in the development of states. Recall, for instance, the reform in Russia in the 1860s-1870s (the so-called Milytin reforms), and the reforms of the 1920s carried out by Mikhail Furze.

The reforms of the 1960s were called for by the advent of nuclear weapons. They led to radical transformations in the Soviet Armed Forces that were chiefly based on military-technical and strategic factors. Today reforms are first of all motivated by socio-political and economic considerations, by a new period in the life of our state and of the whole of mankind. Reforms are to be carried out in all the structures of state, party and public life connected with the defence of the state, with the goals at ruling out another war, guaranteeing more reliable protection of our own and allied countries, arriving at a reasonable combination of political and military measures, and saving funds for the sake of the nation's accelerated economic progress.

Now that the first attempts are being made to draw the popular masses into the making of foreign policy, that the citizen diplomacy concept has been put forward, the process of shaping military doctrine and military policy can no longer remain an exclusive prerogative of the state's military-political bodies. The problems involved require an all-round and collective analysis. An end should be put to the nondemocratic practice of making military-political decisions behind closed doors and carrying them out by injunction. The people should have a hand in working out and implementing military doctrine, it would be expedient to discuss the issue at a Congress of People's Deputies and to publish the results in the papers.

A doctrine without doctrinairism

The first step towards a new mechanism for shaping and carrying out military policy has already been made. The Committee for Defence and State Security has been formed under the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet. Unfortunately, however, the committee has not yet attained a standard of professionalism which would allow it to contribute substantially to defence policy making.

It pays to enlist social scientists concerned with problems of war and peace, as well as military theoreticians, in working out the general provisions of military doctrine. In academic institutes and in higher educational establishments numerous "civil strategists" have appeared—scientists well versed in problems of international security. In cooperation with military theoreticians they are likely to shape a genuinely scientific military policy.

Before this or that provision and principle become binding on all state, party and public organizations, it should be given a profound study and discussion by competent scientific audiences. This does not mean, of course, that military secrets will be divulged while dealing with specific military-technical problems. However, the principles that undergird policy decisions should be made public. Besides everything else, a thorough elaboration of the key provisions of Soviet military doctrine can bring out new reserves for the organization of reliable defences and ways of saving defence expenditures.

It is necessary to ascertain the functions of and the roles played in dealing with defence problems by the supreme Soviet, the Congress of People's Deputies, the Council of Ministers, the CPSU Central Committee, the Council for Defence, the Ministry of Defence, the Chief Political Administration of the Soviet Army and Navy, and the state and party bodies subordinated to them. in our opinion, the Law on Defence should clearly define the functions to be discharged in this sphere by all state and party bodies, officials and private individuals. The time

is ripe for establishing new relationships between the people, the Soviets and the party, on the one hand, and the army, on the other.

Does the threat of war still exist?

In their foreign policy strategy our party and government presently proceed from the basic propositions of the new political thinking, and from new concepts of security and internationalist duty. Unfortunately, not all the aspects of our defence policy fully accord with our foreign policy line, with the ideas of perestroika and with present-day realities and the outlook for the future. This applies, in particular, to the country's defence system and its relationship to the processes now under way in the Warsaw Treaty Organization, to the correlation of the fighting arms, offensive and defensive forces in peace and in wartime army structures, and of the numbers and deployment of permanently assigned and reduced personnel. There is a pressing need to further professionalize the army, to improve the ways in which the army is manned and kept combat ready, and to step up the efficiency of its deployment organization.

In military matters, it is necessary to take a more objective view of the world's realities and of the specific potentialities of the state. The situations in which armed forces can be used must be clearly defined. In a law-governed state any use of the armed forces should be strictly regulated. The right to make decisions on matters pertaining to military cooperation and granting military aid should rest exclusively with the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet. Incidentally, I think we need a special law governing the granting of military aid to friendly states.

In dealing with specific problems of military policy and defence strategy, reformers should proceed from the indisputable fact that the war danger to our country has not been removed. Under the circumstances, effective measures must be taken to counter any threats that may arise. The combat readiness of the army, its composition and morale should be adequate to the degree of danger. At the same time, we must provide for a changeover to the reasonable defence sufficiency principle.

Naturally, the art of warfare is making progress. The armies of all NATO member states continuously adopt new weapons. The same is true of our armed forces. This is a current reality. Therefore, emphasis should be placed on restraining the arms race, on a steady reduction of armies and armaments, and on coordination of their levels. Under no circumstances should the country get drawn into another round of the arms race. It is common knowledge that previously our reaction to the west's war preparations was of the "mirror reflection" kind. Now this principle of our defence strategy has been abandoned. The new approach to guaranteeing our state's security manifests itself in the Soviet proposals for restricting military activity, for setting up zones of lower arms and troop concentrations, and for improving arms control. The specific problems to be dealt with now have to do with preventing incidental clashes. This presupposes, in particular, mutual identification of alarm systems, the establishment of a uniform mutual warning system, and of stronger guarantees against an unsanctioned accidental use of arms...

Temporizing and survival

While reorganizing our armed forces we must bear in mind that they are being reduced and are likely to be further reduced in the future. This tendency deserves an elevated status as a new principle underlying defence policy. It should determine the solution of many problems such as those connected with the organizational structure of the armed forces, their technical equipment, manning, unit formation, and the organization of security and control forces.

If nuclear and conventional arms reduction talks are a success, an entirely new world military-political and strategic situation will result. In this connection it already pays to consider creating defence models which envision deep de-escalations of arms and the armed forces.

Consequently, war reform should embrace not only practical defence policy, but the development of military theory as well. Our notions of war and the army are still largely outdated, inadequate to the level of development of political relations and fail to answer many topical questions such as what the classification of modern war is, what domestic functions should the army discharge, what constitutes the socialist armies' internationalist duty, and how wars can be prevented by military means.

The Warsaw Treaty Organization [WTO] member states have suggested to the NATO countries that both military-political alliances be dissolved. This circumstances calls for the scientific forecasting of WTO outlooks and of Soviet defence strategy. The military reform should be brought into conformity with the new situation in Central and Eastern Europe. Therefore, new forms of cooperation with WTO countries should be developed already now.

The Political Consultative Committee should quickly formulate a programme statement on the fate of the two blocs. In connection with the new processes under way in the U.S.S.R., Bulgaria, Poland, Hungary, the G.D.R., Romania and Czechoslovakia, contacts within the WTO will presumably become more varied. Besides, it is expected that the WTO itself will gradually transform along the lines of its further politization. Military-political contacts between states will expand, and links will be established between various parties and movements. National and geopolitical interests rather than ideological ones will probably come to the fore. All this will require the improvement of the mechanisms of allied interaction and a more lively dialogue within the WTO.

The socialist countries' armed forces cannot but be interdependent in this integral and interdependent world

of ours. Survival presupposes a prompt definition of the content and forms of cooperation between them. This is an urgent matter which brooks no delay.

Justice Ministry Views Military Tribunals' Work

PM0404101190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[Major of Justice V. Zvyagintsev report: "USSR Ministry of Justice Collegium"]

[Text] A session of the USSR Ministry of Justice Collegium has been held under the chairmanship of Minister V.F. Yakovlev. The organization of the work of military tribunals in preventing crimes connected with the violation regulations governing mutual relations between servicemen was the issue discussed.

The report of Lieutenant General of Justice A.I. Muranov, member of the Collegium and chief of the Military Tribunal Directorate, noted that the eradication of these negative phenomena is now at the focus of attention of the command staff, political organs, and military jurists. So, for instance, military tribunals are examining some 80 percent of the cases in this category in the presence of personnel. One in three sentences is announced in the command's orders. Legal propaganda has been intensified.

Attention was drawn to the need to step up the work of justice and court organs in the prevention of juvenile delinquency and the elaboration and implementation of additional measures to improve young people's preparation for service.

The Collegium proceedings were attended by Lieutenant General of Justice N.A. Petukhov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Court Military Collegium, Colonel General N.I. Shlyaga, first deputy chief of the the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, representatives of military justice organs, of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, of public education, and of the USSR DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy].

Preparations for WWII Anniversary Discussed

PM0304130190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Mar 90 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "In Preparation for Nationwide Holiday"]

[Text] Just over a month remains until the nationwide holiday—the 45th anniversary of the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War. The progress of preparations for this memorable date and what still has to be done in the remaining time—these and other questions were examined at a sitting of the USSR Ministry of Defense Collegium.

Reports were delivered by Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, and Army General D.S. Sukhorukov, USSR deputy defense minister for cadres.

The reports and speeches by Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov, chairman of the All-Union Council of War, Labor, and Armed Forces Veterans, and other participants in the sitting noted that significant organizational and ideological work on preparations for the victory anniversary has been done in the Army and Navy. It is primarily aimed at improving the ideological and political tempering of Soviet soldiers, enhancing the vigilance and improving the combat readiness of troops and naval forces, and strengthening military discipline and law and order. This work is meant to help to deepen perestroyka in the Army and Navy and implement the policy of ensuring priority for qualitative parameters in military building and the training of units and subunits.

One of the main avenues in this work is to demonstrate the tremendous importance of our great victory for the fate of the country and all mankind and the Soviet Union's decisive contribution to the rout of fascist Germany and militarist Japan. By stepping up work on patriotic and international education and propagandizing the heroic traditions of the people, the party, the Army, and the Navy, it is important to seek to strengthen soldiers' sense of pride at being part of the USSR Armed Forces and their desire to make a personal contribution to augmenting their glory. The most important objective of this work is to shape Soviet people's patriotic, defense consciousness and their readiness to defend the socialist fatherland.

Having analyzed the activity of military councils, commanders, and political organs from this standpoint, the collegium noted that preparations for the nationwide holiday are still not being conducted at the proper level everywhere. There are places where work is limited to sporadic measures whose content at times falls below modern requirements. Attempts to denigrate our military history and discredit the Armed Forces are not always properly rebuffed.

In this context it was proposed to utilize the time remaining before the holiday with the utmost efficiency. The paramount task is to ensure high ideological and political standards in all planned events, including veterans' meeting with young people, festive meetings, demonstrations, and events to honor Great Patriotic War veterans.

An immutable demand regarding these events is that they be organically linked with the present, with the tasks being solved by units and ships, and comprehensively consider factors like the multinational composition of military collectives and many servicemen's inadequate knowledge of memorable pages of the Great Patriotic War annals. It is impossible to overlook the complex sociopolitical situation prevailing in a series of regions in the country. All work to prepare for the memorable date is meant to help to the maximum extent to affirm in

people's minds the ideas of patriotism, internationalism, and unbreakable unity between all generations.

"Nobody has been forgotten, nothing has been forgotten"—it is fundamentally important to ensure that this slogan does not remain just a meaningless call but is truly implemented in life.

The state is implementing measures to improve material and daily living conditions for war veterans. It is important to ensure that all available opportunities are utilized at local level too.

The preparation for the memorable date is meant to help step up work on creating an all-union book of remembrance. It should give a fresh impetus to the propaganda of traditions in every regiment and on every ship. It is impossible to tolerate the situation whereby servicemen are ignorant of their units' past history. We have no right to behave like persons of unknown ancestry as regards our common history—the history of the fatherland, the party, and the Armed Forces—or the history of our own division, regiment, or company. One of the main tasks today is not to limit ourselves to just mass events, not to rest content with figures indicating general involvement, but to reach each and every soldier and seaman and make them part of the heroic traditions.

In this context responsible tasks face the mass media, including the military press, and cultural and educational institutions. Commanders and political organs are called upon to maintain permanent contacts with staffers of central and local newspapers, radio, and television. The work being done must help to strengthen collaboration with local party and soviet organs, labor collectives, and public organizations. The enhancement of the Army's prestige and the strengthening of ties with the local population will be promoted by the organization of open days, joint festive demonstrations, and other events at units.

Military councils, commanders, and political organs must pay special attention to the organization of planned meetings with Heroes of the Soviet Union and veterans awarded all classes of the Order of Glory, as well as other meetings, including those to be attended by invited foreign delegations.

Universal concern must be shown for the proper appearance of Great Patriotic War monuments and burial grounds of the motherland's defenders both on our country's territory and abroad. Specific instructions in this connection were issued to the appropriate officials.

It was emphasized that all work to prepare for the 45th anniversary of victory must be conducted in unbreakable unity with preparations for the 120th anniversary of V.I. Lenin's birth, the 28th CPSU Congress, and the report and election campaign in party organizations.

The collegium sitting was addressed by L.N. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo [title as published], and D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister.

Baltic Republics

Lithuanian Envoy Accepts Referendum Possibility

LD0504125790 Moscow TASS in English 1246 GMT 5 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow April 5 TASS—Lawyer Egidius Bickauskas, 35, who has led the Lithuanian permanent mission in Moscow since April 2, does not rule out the idea of the holding of a referendum in Lithuania about its secession from the USSR.

"I'm regarded as a moderate in the republic, since I'm not an advocate of the republic's orientation only on the West," Bickauskas told TASS.

"Relations within the USSR, which have developed over decades, are so diverse and strong that their break-up will benefit nobody."

The representative sees his initial task in establishing a dialogue between Vilnius and Moscow. There is no such dialogue now, while problems are mounting, he believes.

Then, the mission should explain the policy of the republican leadership here and all developments in Lithuania, Bickauskas continued.

Touching on the current situation in the republic, he stressed that, although the Lithuanian Republic proclaimed its independence, however, it does not exist de facto, since principal issues, including military questions, remain unsolved.

"We understand Soviet strategic interests in Lithuania which are of a European and even of a world scale. This aspect of our relations should be discussed," stressed the representative.

In his words, the republic is ready for compromises and, it is quite probable, "may offer more than the centre expects."

He noted that "Lithuania is ready to look for a compromise concerning the spring military conscription, since this factor may create an explosive situation."

Asked about a change of the imposition of a direct presidential rule in Lithuania, he doubted the expediency of such a move. In his opinion, such rule can be ensured only by the presence of military force.

Vilnius Radio Carries 4 Apr Council Session

Agenda Adopted

LD0404122790

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1100 GMT on 4 April begins carrying a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius, chaired by K. Motieka and A. Abisalas.

Abisalas proposes a more detailed agenda: 1. greetings to the Estonian Supreme Soviet; 2. response to the USSR president's appeal; 3. statement of the Lithuanian Supreme Council; 4. law on setting up of independent state organs; 5. information on the state of debates on the issue of recruitment of Lithuanian citizens into the Soviet Armed Forces; 6. status, working conditions of a deputy of the Lithuanian Supreme Council; 7. information given by E. Zingeris, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission on the fact that a delegation of the International Red Cross was turned back at the airport of Vilnius by the KGB.

At 1105 GMT greetings of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, and congratulations to the Estonian people in their aspirations for independence are read.

At 1110 GMT the text of greetings is debated. It is decided to take a vote on the edited text after the adjournment today.

At 1111 GMT the draft reply to the appeal of President Gorbachev is presented. The text is read. It says that the whole responsibility in the event of military coup to overthrow the legitimate government and its consequences would be placed solely on the Government of the USSR.

At 1116 GMT debates are held on the draft reply. Many deputies propose to edit the text.

Some deputies voice an opinion that this reply to Gorbachev is rather premature and should not be hastily adopted. However, Vytautas Landsbergis is of a different opinion. He says that this reply is not meant to inform people of Lithuania, it is meant to inform the world. He says no one could be sure when this small political group, which is today supported by the Soviet Government, would be instructed to ask for more than usurping the publication of Lithuanian press. Landsbergis says that this is not the case of either sacrifying the leader of the USSR or helping Lithuania.

Landsbergis also proposed some changes in the text of the reply.

At 1128 GMT Deputy Andriukaitis says that the main point which should be stressed in the response is the continuation of occupation and the creeping aggression by the Soviet Government.

At 1130 GMT K. Motieka says that staff members of the Procurator's Office and other legal institutions were given time to renounce the decisions of the Supreme Council of the republic and to recognize the USSR Constitutions, or else they would not be admitted to their workplaces.

At 1140 GMT an editing commission is selected to work on the draft text of the response to Gorbachev.

At 1143 GMT Deputy Cepaitis takes the the floor to present the reply proposed by the Human Rights Commission, which says that the act of independence adopted on 11 March cannot be made null and void—this is history and people will never forget it. The Russian version of the reply is also read.

At 1150 GMT the two versions of the reply to Gorbachev are debated.

At 1205 GMT editing commissions are elected to work on the texts which should be adopted later.

At 1206 GMT Landsbergis reads the decree of the Presidium of the Lithuanian Supreme Council which granted the citizenship to two young American Lithuanians born in the United States.

At 1210 GMT the next issue on the agenda, setting up of independent state organs, begins.

Military Service Debated

LD0404170590

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1210 GMT on 4 April continues its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council in Vilnius.

At 1210 GMT it is proposed that the independent state organs should be the committee for environmental protection, the state control committee, and others. These state organs would not be subbordinate to any ministry or department.

At 1215 GMT the issue is debated.

At 1225 GMT a report is read on the protection of cultural monuments. A proposal is made to set up a special department to deal with the issue.

At 1230 GMT Rita Dapkute and Aidas Palubinskas are given certificates of citizenship of the republic of Lithuania, and the session is adjourned until 1320 GMT.

At 1330 GMT the discussion on setting up independent state bodies continues.

At 1342 GMT a report is made by MP [member of parliament] (Dainis Standsbergis) from Latvia. He expresses Latvia's support for Lithuania.

At 1348 GMT Deputy (Jankunas) reads the text of the appeal to the Estonian Supreme Soviet.

At 1452 GMT a vote is taken on the appeal to the Estonian Supreme Soviet: 91 vote in favor, two deputies abstain; the appeal is adopted.

At 1344 GMT Landsbergis reads a telegram of support from the Dalai Lama.

At 1356 GMT discussion of the military service issue begins. The draft decision prepared by the Parliamentary Commission for the Restoration of Statehood is read. It states that international conventions forbid occupying armies to recruit local people. It says that young men should decide for themselves if they want to be recruited into the Soviet Armed Forces. A group of five deputies prepared another decision, which is read out, as well.

At 1410 GMT proposals for boycotting recruitment are read out. These include: the return of military registration documents, antimilitary demonstrations, the organization of a republican army, the declaration of Lithuania as a disaster area should the Soviets begin the forced recruitment of Lithuanian young people, and many others. After this, debates on the issue begin.

At 1418 GMT a deputy urges restraints on calling for young Lithuanians to abstain from joining the Soviet Armed Forces because the government has no means of protecting them.

At 1424 GMT there is a proposal to choose one of the two draft declarations. The majority of deputies decide that the draft prepared by the group of five deputies should be worked on and later adopted.

At 1428 GMT discussions on the text of the declaration are in progress.

At 1442 GMT Deputy Stankevicius takes the floor to discuss other aspects on the basis of which young men might refuse to serve in the Soviet Armed Forces. One of the proposals was that young men should renounce their Soviet citizenship.

At 1447 GMT a telegram to the USSR Government is read concerning the law on the compulsary recruitment of Lithuanian young men into the Soviet Armed Forces.

At 1449 GMT a declaration of protest by the Lithuanian Komsomol is read, saying that the former Lenin Komsomol organization spoke in the name of Lithuanian young people, although they had no mandate to do so.

At 1450 GMT a statement of the Lithuanian Supreme Council is read. It is adopted by a majority vote.

At 1456 GMT an appeal to the people of Lithuania by the cardinal and bishops of the Lithuanian Catholic Church to believers in Lithuania is read out.

At 1500 GMT the session is adjourned until 1545 GMT.

Gorbachev Reply Examined

LD0404173390

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1545 GMT on 4 April resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council in Vilnius. A draft reply to Gorbachev is read out. An alternative version also is read out. It is decided to examine the two versions and adopt one of them tomorrow.

At 1557 GMT questions are asked about tomorrow's agenda;

At 1558 GMT a draft appeal to Lithuania's young people due for military service is read, and a debate on the appeal takes place. The appeal is adopted by a majority vote.

At 1612 GMT the proceedings at the Supreme Council has ended. The session will resume its work at 0700 GMT 5 April.

Lithuanian Supreme Council Greetings to Estonia

LD0404155190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council message to Estonian people read at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Text] The Lithuanian Republic Supreme Council congratulates and supports the victory of democratic forces in the parliament of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and is attentively following events in Tallinn. For the Lithuanian people a great impression was created by the first radical steps of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet elected by democratic methods. The Supreme Soviet called what happened in 1940 an occupation, and announced the beginning of the restoration of the state. A declaration was adopted on the restoration of the Estonian state. We assess this as the sacred will and (?statement) of the Estonian people. Echoes of friendship were heard from us also for the statement of the Estonian Republic on the restoration of independence of Lithuania. This is especially important for us as a legal interpretation and moral support which you gave to the aspirations of the Lithuanian people. This gives us strength on our difficult road to independence. We thank you for your help, and we hope for cooperation.

We recognize your state which you are restoring. We are linked by unity. Fifty years ago the independent states of Lithuanian and Estonia forcibly lost their independence, and our peoples went through no little oppression and threats. But the Estonians, like the Lithuanians, found in themselves the boldness, strength and will to sort things out, to tell the whole world about the rights of a people to live freely and to run the economy independently. The Lithuanian Republic Supreme Council greets the deputies [words indistinct] and the Estonian people, which has taken a decisive step in the direction of freedom, and wishes it selflessness on the way to achieving full independence.

Supreme Council Statement Accuses USSR

LD0404162190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1100 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Statement by the Lithuanian Supreme Council read out at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Text] On 11 March 1990, a democratically elected Lithuanian Supreme Council restored the independent Lithuanian state and formed the government of the Lithuanian Republic and other state institutions which, with the approval and support of society, are discharging their functions. However, the USSR, using its Armed Forces and other means, is endeavoring to create tension in Lithuania and to disrupt the normal work of the Lithuanian state organs. Striving to hide these actions from the world and to block attempts to get information, the USSR is blockading international communications and stopping the activity of foreign diplomats and journalists in Lithuania. These and other USSR aggressive actions crudely violate universally recognized principles of international law and pose a real threat to the state sovereignty of the Lithuanian Republic, the people's life and health.

The USSR, with the aid of its Army, is supporting small groups of its political supporters which are striving to restore the old structures of the USSR administration. This is threatening to overthrow the legally elected authority and the government which has formed in Lithuania.

The Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania, in view of the real threat to the independence of Lithuania, states that the whole responsibility for the people's misfortunes and political [words indistinct] consequences falls on the USSR supreme leadership.

Supreme Council Reads Military Service Appeal

LD0404201390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1558 GMT 4 Apr 90

["Appeal" to Lithuanian young people due for military service, adopted at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Text] An appeal to Lithuania's young men:

Moscow, having proclaimed the right of the people to self- determination, as we see, does not wish to let Lithuania live in freedom and independence. The nation's traitors, [words indistinct], collaborators, then tanks, armored vehicles, and paratroopers are enlisted, but the truth is acknowledged all over the world of our love for our homeland, our endurance and our unarmed but united resistance to the enslavers are on our side.

The USSR Government has announced the spring draft of young people into its Army. What should we do? This question is asked by Lithuania's young men, their mothers, and the whole of Lithuania. Your democratically elected Lithuanian parliament, having restored our homeland's honor and dignity on 11 March, believes that by not going to serve in the army of a foreign state, you will consolidate our independence. General refusal by Lithuania's citizens would mean yet another step benefitting Lithuania's independence. Although the Lithuanian government cannot forcibly defend its citizens against compulsory recruitment, it assumes juridical responsibility for the refusal by young people of its state to serve the aliens. It will apply all possible efforts to protect you, Lithuania's sons. The Supreme Council,

with the laws it has adopted, has abrogated your duty to serve in the USSR Army and has suspended the work of military commissariats. Lithuania's courts will not convict those refusing to serve in the foreign army. Our government is seeking possibilities to replace military service by other duties to our country.

The leadership of the republic of Lithuania is endeavoring to start negotiations with the Soviet Union in order to finally solve this exceptionally important problem, which is painful for us. It has already appealed to the International Red Cross and to all organizations defending human rights, asking them for support in case of possible conflicts.

The Lithuanian Supreme Council advises young people of call-up age to register at local councils so that their attitude and their resolution to unarmed resistance are known. If some of you are taken illegally, by force, into the USSR Armed Forces, it will mean anguish and anxiety not only to your parents, to those close to you, but also to all of us.

Lithuanian Council Issues Anti-USSR Statement

LD0404224690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1740 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Vilnius, 4 April (TASS)—TASS special correspondents report:

The first session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, which is taking place here, today discussed two alternative draft replies from the republic's Supreme Soviet to the USSR president's appeal. It did not manage to reach agreement on the content of this document. In all probability the session will adopt the document tomorrow.

At the same time the Supreme Soviet at the end of the day adopted a statement in connection with the situation in the repubic. It claims that the USSR "is attempting by the use of its Armed Forces and also by other means to cause tension in Lithuania and to disrupt the normal functioning of the Lithuanian Republic's bodies." These actions are described in the statement as "aggressive, infringing the principles of international law and causing real danger for the sovereignty of the Lithuanian Republic." There thus arises, the document alleges, "a danger of the overthrow of the lawfully elected Supreme Soviet and the government that has been formed."

In the face of this threatened danger, the document emphasized: "We declare that the entire responsibility for the possible misfortunes and political consequences of a military coup will lie with the top leadership of the USSR."

Komsomol Official Interviewed on Gorbachev Visit

LD0404120490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1000 GMT on 4 April broadcasts an interview with Valeriy Makeyev, member of the coordinating council of the Committee of the Republican Center of the Lithuanian Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League], by correspondent Vladimir Koroblev. Makeyev met Gorbachev yesterday and handed him the appeal by the Lithuanian Komsomol. He says that many people in Lithuania are very concerned, and gives a rehash of the content of the message. The problem can only be solved in the context of the Constitution. He says one side is doing everything it can to make dialogue impossible. The Supreme Council will not even talk about concessions.

Makeyev says Gorbachev gave him a book about his visit to the republic in January, in which some of the current Lithuanian leaders assured him that there was no talk of secession. Now, two months later, they have forgotten their promises. He says he is convinced that the leaders have set their goal to extinguish the process of perestroyka in the country: they know very well what their actions could lead to. Unfortunately there is no change in this yet, he says, which is why the Komsomol sent their message to Gorbachev.

More on Komsomol Appeal

LD0404195190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Presenter] Yesterday Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev received Valeriy Makeyev, member of the coordinating committee of the republican center of the Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol] in Lithuania. He gave the USSR president an appeal from the republic's Komsomol—which at the moment unites 35,000 people—which contains a request to introduce direct presidential rule in Lithuania. The text of that appeal has been published in the newspapers today, while Valeriy has come to us here in the studio. Valeriy, as I understand it, handing over this text, this document, to the president, was not your only task?

[Makeyev] That's right, of course. You know, now, when passions have flared to the limit in the republic, when the voice of reason is virtually unheard, this universal euphoria which has seized a large part of the republic's population has led to a very tense situation. Several dozen people—and this is in the appeal—who are now in power in the republic's Supreme Soviet, with their decision of 11 March on leaving the USSR, have turned the fate of hundreds of thousands of people upside down, without conducting either a referendum or any kind of poll. Of course all of this cannot but provoke some kind of concern among people, and this meeting with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, which took place yesterday, was to bring to the attention of our country's president the pain of the people who live in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev reported that he, as USSR president and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, still believes that there is only one way out of this situation—it is the abrogation of the

decisions and laws adopted on and after 11 March by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, and that this complex and very painful matter can only be resolved on the basis of USSR laws.

[Presenter] Incidentally, everybody in the republic and in the Union, and for that matter in other countries, is now waiting for results. Lithuania is asking for talks. So far there is no answer from here, from the center. Can this be considered a reply?

[Makeyev] You know, Lithuania as such is not asking for talks, but rather, one could call it an ultimatum, and Mikhail Sergeyevich's recent appeal has already been evaluated as the first step to talks. However, the position of the president and the government is the same: Talks and dialogue with the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet can only be conducted when the decisions adopted since 11 March have been repealed. That's the position.

[Presenter] Can this be considered an official reply?

[Makeyev] Yes.

Landsbergis Sees Moscow Talks as 'Positive Step'

LD0404224190 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Yesterday's meeting in Moscow between three Lithuanian parliamentarians and Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Soviet Presidential Council, was given a green light by Mikhail Gorbachev himself. This was made public at a news conference in Vilnius today, half an hour after the three Lithuanian members of parliament returned from the Soviet capital.

The Lithuanian envoys, Deputy Premier Romualdas Ozolas and Members of Parliament Mecys Laurinkus and Romas Gudaitis, had gone to Moscow for a meeting with the Soviet Minister of Defense Dmitriy Yazov. They had tried twice by phone to arrange a meeting with the minister, but the latter categorically replied he was not authorized to speak with representatives of another state. At the news conference in Vilnius, Member of Parliament Romas Gudaitis interpreted the minister's words as recognition of Lithuania's statehood.

As for the meeting with Aleksandr Yakovlev, the Lithuanian parliamentarians said that it was unofficial and both sides had agreed not to disclose publicly the contents of the talks. The Lithuanian envoys could only say that Aleksandr Yakovlev was, as usual, well-disposed to Lithuania. This might mean that the talk in Moscow ought to be followed by a stage of consultations between Vilnius and Moscow. As Romas Gudaitis put it, there should be an exchange of opinions on various governmental levels which should result in bilateral talks on the state level.

Chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council Vytautas Landsbergis, who was also present at the news conference, defined the talk in Moscow as a major positive step. This is already dialogue; all sitting at one table. Such a talk is much more valuable than correspondence, Vytautas Landsbergis pointed out.

Referring to the motives of witholding the contents of the talk from the public, Lithuanian Deputy Premier Romualdas Ozolas said that the issues in Moscow pertained more to the competence of the presidium of the Lithuanian Supreme Council. He noted that perhaps the talk will have an effect on some decisions of the Lithuanian parliament, which the public will see in the parliament's actions.

According to Romualdas Ozolas, the meeting in the Kremlin was also positive because it may ease the tension and hostility towards Lithuania in the Soviet Union. The tension, as he put it, does exist and is likely to remain long into the future. Yet the Kremlin talk gives some optimism. The Lithuanian members of parliament also mentioned a preliminary agreement to already hold a meeting this week with other representatives of the Soviet Union's leadership. Romas Gudaitis said it could be talk with another member of the USSR Presidential Council, Minister of Internal Affairs Bakatin.

It was disclosed at the news conference that while in Moscow, Mecys Laurinkus and Romas Gudaitis had made an attempt to get in touch with the Soviet interior minister, but Minister Bakatin had said he was too busy at present, but did promise to receive Lithuanian members of parliament in the near future, perhaps this week. It was not said at the news conference who would represent Lithuania in these probable future talks.

Representatives Interviewed

LD0404204490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] A scheduled news conference for Lithuanian and foreign journalists took place in the building of the Lithuanian Supreme Council today. It was opened by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the republic's Supreme Council.

Questions from journalists were answered by deputy chairman of the Supreme Council Romualdas Ozolas and deputies Mecys Laurinkus and Romas Gudaitis, who returned from Moscow today. Romualdas Ozolas, answering journalists' questions about talks in Moscow, noted that they were confidential. Therefore, naturally, the journalists did not get an exhaustive answer. However, it was stated that the results of the Moscow talks will be, possibly, better expressed by imminent actions.

Romas Gudaitis assessed their trip as a mission of goodwill. He expressed his hope that perhaps even this week a meeting between our representatives and USSR Interior Minister Bakatin, will take place.

Vytautas Landsbergis assessed these talks, although unofficial, as a positive step toward a dialogue which will replace the present correspondence. It is most important that our representatives parted without anger and therefore a new meeting is possible.

Landsbergis Urges Telegrams Be Sent to Gorbachev

LD0404213790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Correspondent P. Orlov report]

[Text] Work continues in the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, and not just in the session hall. In reply to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's message to the Lithuanian people, Chairman Landsbergis of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet called on all those who support the decision on establishing Lithuania's independence to reply by telegram. [video shows Supreme Soviet in session, with Landsbergis speaking from the rostrum]

Now we are at the place where these telegrams are being received.

[Begin recording of unidentified woman] A few thousand, perhaps, will be unsupportive...[video shows clerical workers sorting letters] [end recording]

Lithuania really is not very big, and for this reason, at times, totally different events take place simultaneously on a small square. [video shows demonstration in a square in which participants hold aloft Soviet flags and placards supporting Gorbachev, approving presidential rule]

A meeting was held opposite the building of the Supreme Soviet today, attended by USSR people's deputies of the Union group. They told those gathered that they had paid visits to enterprises and units of servicemen, meeting the inhabitants of Lithuania, and want to report the view of those they saw to the Supreme Soviet and to the USSR president.

The meeting adopted an appeal calling for the introduction of presidential rule.

Further on Lithuanian Supreme Council's Response

LD0504055490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 5 Apr 90

[Correspondent Elene Kurkletyte report from Lithuania]

[Text] Yesterday, the session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet continued its work. Deputies discussed their answer to the appeal by the president of the USSR to the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. In this answer, in this letter, it is stated that the perestroyka and democratization begun in the USSR have created conditions for the election of a Supreme Soviet invested with the authority of the expression of the will of the people. We received our mandate, says the letter, from the electorate who voted precisely for those candidates who are coming out in favor of the restoration of state independence. It is precisely for this reason that we do not have the right to change our decision or in any way revoke the act on the restoration of state independence of 11 March 1990. Further, it is stated that if there is a political resolution of this issue, the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic is ready to start talks on all levels and discuss the conditions for the restoration of the independence of Lithuania, taking into account the interests of the Soviet Union.

I do not have any newspapers yet at this early hour. I am just expounding the essence of the letter, the essence of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet's answer to Mikhail Gorbachev, the president of the USSR.

Rallies took place in Vilnius yesterday in support of the decisions of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet on the restoration of an independent Lithuanian state. And rallies against these decisions also took place. They were organized by various public organizations of Lithuania, unions, and committees. Various messages and letters were also accepted which were directed toward the president of the USSR and his appeal to the people of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Lithuania Cables Leaders on Military Service

LD0404160690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1233 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] In connection with the numerous requests arriving on problems connected with service in the USSR Armed Forces for young men of Lithuania, the Council of Ministers of the Lithuanian Republic today sent a telegram to Army General Yazov, USSR minister of defense; Katusev, USSR deputy procurator general and chief military procurator; and Yermakov, commander of troops of the Leningrad Military District, and the commander of troops units. The telegram says that on 12 March 1990 the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic adopted a resolution halting the operation on the republic's territory of the USSR Law on General Servicemen's Duties. In this way, citizens of the Lithuanian Republic who quit their military service and return home cannot be considered deserters and cannot be held criminally liable. Questions connected with the interests of the defense of the USSR and Lithuania, including the further military service of young men of Lithuania in the USSR Armed Forces, will be decided through negotiations between the Governments of the USSR and the Lithuanian Republic, the telegram says.

USSR Citizens Committees Form in Lithuania

90UN1375B Moscow TRUD in Russian 30 Mar 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "USSR Citizens Committees Created"]

[Text] Vilnius, 29 March (TASS)—USSR citizens committees are being created in Lithuania. V. Dobychin, deputy chairman of the republic committee and first secretary of the Oktyabrskiy Rayon Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania on the CPSU platform, discussed the reasons for their formation and the goals they set for themselves.

"As a result of the situation that has developed, USSR citizens in the republic are actually deprived of firm legal guarantees and social protection. The Supreme Soviet of Lithuania continues, ignoring the decision of the Third USSR Congress of People's Deputies, to adopt legal acts that do not take into account the interests of many thousands of USSR citizens.

"We think that USSR citizens committees should take on the task of protecting the political, economic, social, and legal rights, interests, and freedoms of USSR citizens living in Lithuania. The committee has already appealed to the USSR Supreme Soviet to make it possible for its representatives to speak before the Soviet parliament and present its suggestions and demands."

Speaking of future tasks of the committee, V. Dobychin emphasized that, while unreservedly supporting the right of nations to self- determination, right down to the point of secession, the committee will nonetheless insist that the exercise of these rights must proceed legally.

He said that questions of self-determination should be decided only through a nationwide referendum. And we shall insist that the referendum be conducted with the compulsory observance of two conditions. First, it must be preceded by a truly democratic atmosphere in the republic. This is lacking in the republic today. This is related to the monopolization of the mass media by Sajudis and the recent appearance of direct pressure by the republic leadership on people with different ideas. The second condition is that the referendum be conducted only after the adoption of a law on the procedure for withdrawing from the USSR. When approaching the ballot boxes, each citizen must be clearly aware of the effects of secession on the entire republic and on him personally.

Describing the situation in the republic, V. Dobychin especially noted that the further development of events will depend primarily on the work of the session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet. If the "marathon" of adopting decisions that are unconstitutional from the standpoint of the Basic Law of the USSR continues, and if the rupture in relations with the USSR grows, the situation will continue to become more difficult, he concluded. What could stabilize the situation? It is necessary to halt the conveyor belt of adopting laws and examine the situation calmly. The USSR Citizens Committee, in turn, is open to dialog and even suggests it. So far, unfortunately, this dialog has been rejected.

Committee Tries To Defend 'USSR Citizens'

PM0404215790 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 5 Apr 90 p 2

[S. Doronin report under the general heading "Situation in Lithuania": "People Are Asking for Protection"]

[Text] The Committee for USSR Citizens in Lithuania is a new organization which was set up with a quite specific aim: to defend the legal and social rights of Soviet people—those who have experienced the democratic undertakings of the republic's new leadership.

Here is an example: An order of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers of 27 March suspended the passage of mail carrying food products and other commodities outside the republic. An exception was only made for those consignees who were on military service, in jail, or who are college or school students.

Can one concur with this decision? After all, it also affected Lithuanian citizens to some extent, and not just the Russian-speaking population.

The committee generally receives appeals in emergencies. But these appeals are unfortunately increasing in numbers. Here is a letter from nurse Klavdiya Yakovlevna Burmistrova. After working at the hospital for 20 years, she will be dismissed 21 April. The reason seems serious at first glance: She did not take a refresher course on time to enhance her medical worker's qualifications. Not because she did not want to. Klavdiya Yakovlevna applied three times for training, but her application disappeared on all three occasions. What is she to do now—a woman on her own, whose father died liberating Lithuania?

Here is another situation. Svetlana Edvardovna Treygis has worked since 1982 in one of Vilnius' research institutes, while studying at the same time at the capital's university. She was made redundant and was as a result struck off the housing waiting list. She was offered a choice of jobs—as a draftswoman or as a dishwasher.

As you can see, these two women and many other people have good cause to appeal to this committee. That is why the pressure on those people who have dared to express their view of what is happening in Lithuania, who do not fit into the concept of the new state's national structure, is increasing with every day that passes. The Great Patriotic War invalids form one such category. I do not know what motivated the Kaunas Gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee], but its decision to abolish services for invalids is simply blasphemous. On the threshold of the 45th anniversary of the victory over fascism it may be seen as political imbecility, as an attempt to revise the outcome of the war.

Incidentally, it is quite hard to send a cable to Moscow—and not only because you have to wait in line. They simply will not accept a cable that expresses agreement with the terms of the USSR president's appeal. The situation is the same in the capital and in other cities in the republic. At Klaypeda, for instance, circulation of central newspapers has also been impeded. God help the Main Administration for the Distribution of Printed Matter stallholder who does this—she will be sacked in a flash. I was told this by Y. Bremkauskas, first secretary of Klaypeda Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU Platform) Gorkom [city party committee].

This is the situation in which Major B. Gazizov found himself. In order to somehow entertain his guests from

Latvia who visited him at weekends, he decided to show them Vilnius from the top of the television tower observation platform. After reserving six places the day before, he was simply unable to get there. The television tower was closed for technical reasons. Boris Nurullovich would have been left ignorant of the true situation had it not been for a host of journalists with microphones and television cameras lying in wait for him with the following question: Tell us, you aren't demolition experts or assault troopers? What sensation did the literary fraternity expect? It is easy to guess. Another seizure of an ordinary Lithuanian facility by the military.

Incidentally, no one invited central press representatives to this performance. Certainly, they would hardly have circulated this act of provocation.

As you can see, the committee has enough worries. At present it just has very very few opportunities to really defend USSR citizens' rights. The republic's Supreme Soviet and local authorities are far removed from such problems. What do they care about the fate of individual citizens?

Citizens' Group Organizes Opposition Rally

LD0404230790 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] For 75 minutes the reactionary opposition forces were rallying today outside the building of Lithuania's Supreme Council. The initiator of the rally was the Committee for the Defense of the Soviet Union's Citizens in Lithuania. At the very start of the rally, an incident occurred which, happily, resulted in no casualties. A man climbed onto the platform mounted for the television camera carrying a slogan in Russian which read: "The Soviet Union's route is slavery, Lithuania's route is freedom." A group of several men and women noted the slogan and started swinging the platform, which soon overturned. The cameramen who tried to take photographs also had a rough time. Some of them were jostled severely and their films were attempted to be exposed. Fortunately militiamen intervened in time.

Against the background of this incident the first speaker had already addressed the crowd several thousand strong. By the way, attending the rally were also several people's deputies of the Soviet Union who belong to the especially conservative bloc [word indistinct] which, according to them, unites 300 deputies.

In Vilnius today the floor was given to Viktor Alksnis from Latvia, Yevgeniy Kogan from Estonia, and Colonel Nikolay Petrushenko from Russia. The categorical demands, rude insults, and absurd statements voiced by those speakers gratified those gathered. The speech made by the local Colonel (Sharupov) was marked for its Stalinist-like tone of open threatening. Having pointed out that Lithuania was him home, he said the Army would not leave Lithuania. Morever, it would drive out all the present separatists, or in other words, see them in jail. The above army colonel who surpassed the rest of the 13 orators in (?insolent) lying (?signed) up for the categoric demand: no talks, no concessions, only presidential rule. This is the stand taken today by the Soviet socialist people in Lithuania.

Meanwhile, the citizens of the Lithuanian Republic, dignified and patient, peaceful and rightful, will also voice their opinion within the next few days.

And, in conclusion, another detail concerning us journalists. It was announced at the rally today that at 1700 tomorrow a picket will be staged outside the Lithuanian radio and television headquarters in Vilnius.

More on Rally

LD0404203490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1817 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Vilnius, 4 Apr (TASS)—A mass rally that attracted almost 10,000 people in Vilnius today was a serious warning to Lithuanian parliamentarians and a reminder of the need to take the realities of life into account. The demonstrators went out into the square in front of the republic's Supreme Council from a call from the Committee of USSR Citizens in Lithuania. They expressed their support for the appeal by our country's president.

The banners of Lithuania and Poland and the flags of union republics were raised above the sea of people. "No confrontation between the peoples of Lithuania!" "Parliament! Listen to the voice of reason!" "The working people are with you, M.S. Gorbachev!" "No to the disintegration of the USSR." These slogans were held aloft by people who fear any type of discrimination or persecution for their political convictions or ethnic origin.

Repeating these slogans, speakers stated from the rostrum of the mass meeting that no one wants to deprive the Lithuanians of their right to self-determination. In doing so they noted the danger of attempts to resolve the Lithuanian people's problems at the expense of other nationalities living in Lithuania. There was talk of the "Sajudis" leadership's tendencies toward totalitarianism and usurpation of power. Those who spoke flatly rejected attacks on the Soviet Army, which recently has been called nothing other than an army of "occupation" by the Lithuanian mass media. The speakers expressed their support for the introduction of presidential rule and the holding of a referendum in the republic.

Those gathered were addressed with words of support by USSR People's Deputies Nikolay Petrushenko, Yevgeniy Kogan, and Viktor Alksnis.

Defense Ministry Discusses Anti-Army Campaign

LD0404175690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1544 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 Apr (TASS)—We are transmitting a report from the press center of the USSR Ministry of Defense:

"The tendency [kren] toward disruption of the spring call-up is revealing itself more and more clearly in the anti-Army campaign unleashed by the separatist forces in the Baltic republics. In particular, at the session of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania calls are being heard to temporarily suspend or postpone it. Ignoring the decision of the USSR Council of Ministers of 29 March 1990, K. Prunskiene, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Lithuania, on 3 April signed an instruction forbidding local soviets to take part in the call-up and also on ending the financing, and the economic and transport provision of the military commissariats. A similar campaign is being carried out in the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic. 'The League of Women,' 'Geneva-49' and other nationalistic organizations are demanding that the call-up be boycotted. Extremist elements are resorting to threatening and blackmailing officials of the military registration and enlistment offices.

"In the town of Paernu, nationalistic associations have adopted an appeal to the Supreme Soviet and the government of Estonia in which they demand an end to assisting military registration and enlistment offices in carrying out the call-up, as well as the recall of Estonian servicemen performing service on the territory of other republics and the withdrawal of all 'occupying forces' from Estonia. The appeal points out that in the event of measures not being adopted in this direction, unofficial organizations will continue the struggle not only by political means, but will also 'take more serious actions.'

"There it is, the true face of the separatists: They espouse 'freedom' and 'democracy' and make protests on invented acts of violence on the part of subunity of the Soviet Army, while they themselves speak the language of threats and ultimatums. They are counting on the timorous.

"It is quite clear that the organizers of this unworthy campaign are thinking least of all about the fates of young people, both of the servicemen they are convincing to desert and of conscripts whom they are inciting to evade service. Quite a few cases are known in which youths who have been confused by them bitterly repent the deed, cursing their unsolicited patrons. Thus, on 3 March, six servicemen of Lithuanian nationality who had left military units without leave reported to the Kaunas military commandant's office. That, of course, will be regarded as a mitigating circumstance in determining the degree of their guilt. At the same time, it should be stressed that all servicemen who have deserted will be returned to their place of service, where the question of their responsibility also will be decided.

"In the Estonian town of Valga, on the night of 2-3 April, a memorial to the Great Patriotic War was damaged by a powerful explosion. The names of those who specifically took part in this blasphemous act are not yet known. However, there can be no doubt that they are from among those who already are issuing ultimatums."

Reportage on Rallies, Pickets Held in Lithuania

Pro-Sajudis Rally Demands Negotiations

LD0504085190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0700 GMT 5 Apr 90

[Report from Sajudis Information Agency]

[Summary] A mass rally of about 8,000 people was held yesterday in Siauliai. The rally was organized by Sajudis.

Representatives of various political parties, guests from Latvia and the Ukraine spoke at the rally. A resolution which demanded the start of negotiations between the USSR and Lithuania and to recognition of the independence of Lithuania was adopted at the rally and sent to Gorbachev.

Picket Held at Printing House

LD0504084190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0700 GMT 5 Apr 90

[Text] The Sajudis Information Agency reports that yesterday two pickets were staged in Vilnius. One of them was organized by the Lithuanian Association of Invalids, the Blind, and the Deaf, and took place outside the building of the Supreme Council.

About 300 people took part in it. The pickets had slogans which read: We are with you, Lithuania; We are strong even without the Soviet Union, There is only one path for Lithuania which is independence.

Another picket was staged at the printing works of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. About 400-500 people took part in it. Slogans in Lithuanian and Russian were raised which read: Out with the occupiers; The press belongs to people and not to the paratroopers Shevd, Burokevicius, and Kuolelis; Farmers survived collectivization, the press will survive Kuolelization. [reference to J. Kuolelis, secretary of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian CPSU]

Lawyers To Picket Procurator's Office

LD0504085390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0700 GMT 5 Apr 90

[Summary] The Sajudis Information Agency reports that the Lithuanian Society of Lawyers appealed to all lawyers of Lithuania, saying that the Soviet Union has occupied the Lithuanian Procurator's Office by force, deposed the procurator general of the republic, and is currently establishing an alternative Procurator's Office to implement the will of an alien state.

The Society of Lithuanian Lawyers urged all the lawyers of the republic to join the picket outside the building of the republican Procurator's Office in Vilnius which will take place on 6 April at 1000 GMT.

Lithuanian Publisher on Possible Sanctions

LD0404134790 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 3 Apr 90

[Excerpts] The Lithuanian Communist Party, now independent from Moscow, is experiencing dramatic changes since the restoration of the Lithuanian Republic. An estimated 20,000 communists of Lithuania, who have remained loyal to Moscow, do not recognise the independence of Lithuania, and have (?some claims to the) property of the former unified Lithuanian Communist Party. It would seem that this property should be divided according to the number of communists who decided to remain in this or that party, all the more so that communists of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party several times outnumber those of the Soviet Communist Party here in Lithuania. And let me remind you at this point that nearly 90,000 communists have put down their membership cards altogether, (?and that is) half of all former communists of Lithuania. Party property division has become a red-hot issue, due to actions taken by Moscow. [passage omitted]

Last weekend Soviet Interior Ministry men dressed in militia uniforms tried to (?overtake) the largest newspaper publishing house here in Lithuania. [passage omitted] [Name indistinct], head of the publishing house, said in an interview to Radio Vilnius that under his leadership the house will continue to print favorite newspapers of the Lithuanian people. He also said that the publishing house does not exclude the possibility of an economic blockade.

We feel that economic sanctions might be applied, says (Alfonsas) [word indistinct]. He says: today I received a telegram from the Russian city of Kalinin, saying that without Moscow's permit, (?paints) will not be sent to the Vilnius publishing house, and the only factory producing (?paint) of this kind is situated mainly in that city of Kalinin. [passage indistinct]

Deputies Describe 'Difficult' Lithuanian Situation

LD0304151290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 3 Apr 90

[Excerpts] [Correspondent Vasiliy Bogomolnikov] I invited today to the microphone People's Deputies Yevgeniy Petrov and Kazimieras Uoka. How do you see the situation in the republic?

[Petrov] The situation is difficult because there is no clarity about the actions of Moscow's authorities. But people work peacefully. [passage omitted] Of course, all are interested and waiting for solutions.

[Uoka] It could be added that tension which is being created, and I have in mind not only Lithuanians but also other residents in the republic. It has a negative influence on them, too. I met last night these people, Russian electors, who were saying that they were ashamed. This does not help but exacerbates relations which should be regulated. Such escalation of strength does not help anyone. [passage omitted]

Lithuania Offers Air Time for Political Parties

LD0404161490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1233 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Lithuanian television and radio are providing a rostrum for speeches by representatives of all political parties registered in the republic. The leaders of those parties can receive detailed information on working days between 1000 and 1100 on the following telephone numbers: 66-13-33 and 63-26-23.

Lithuania Bread Shortage Scare Unfounded

90UN1293B Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian in Russian 16 Mar 90 p 1

[ELTA article: "Rest Assured—There Will Be Bread"]

[Text] At a session of the Supreme Soviet of the republic on 14 March, Supreme Soviet Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis expressed his concern that forces hostile to the path Lithuania has chosen may attempt to disrupt the normal methods of providing bread to the residents of Vilnius. Shortly after this message, the Supreme Soviet received the following telegram:

"Vilnius, Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic, Chairman Landsbergis.

"In response to your statement of 14 May, we communicate that the bakers of Vilnius have worked, are working, and will continue to work in a constant manner in order to supply baked goods to the populace. We believe that there was no foundation whatsoever for the statement.

"On behalf of the collective—General Director Fedorov."

Soon, another telegram was received:

"Vilnius, Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic. In the event of disruptions in the bread supply to the population of the city, the consumers' cooperatives are prepared to render assistance by supplying bread from the bakeries of consumers' cooperatives in nearby rayons.

"Chief of the Department of the Bread Industry S. Zhalyukas."

Shortly thereafter, several female bakery workers approached the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic and expressed their willingness to continue working even after the end of their shift.

20 Mar Landsbergis Supreme Soviet Speech

90UN1357A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian
22 Mar 90 pp 1, 2

[Speech by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic, at the 20 March plenary meeting of the Supreme Soviet session: "On the Political Situation"]

[Text] Esteemed colleague deputies! Allow me first to read two telegrams. One of them is very short and I have managed to translate it. It goes like this: "Moldavia is with you, free Lithuania! On 18 March in Kishinev there was a demonstration of solidarity with the Lithuanian people.

"The Party of Free Moldavia."

I shall try to translate the other telegram right now since I did not have a chance to do it in writing:

"Dear friends and comrades in the same destiny! The Lithuanian people have been living for a week already with the feelings of responsibility and joy for their independence. The restoration of the Lithuanian Republic was a decisive step on the path to national determination and is the most serious challenge to the empire up this point. You are on the front line of the struggle for freedom from which you cannot recede; you can only go forward. The Estonian people are with you. And our struggle for the revocation of our annexation and restoration of the Estonian Republic is reaching its final stage. Our power lies in the unity of the Baltics.

"On behalf of the leadership of the Estonian People's Front—Edgar Saavisar."

The main one of the political events that were widely discussed yesterday, especially in the evening and at night, was the statement from the Soviet Union. I would like to say a couple of words about it, although I have spoken with interested foreign journalists many times during the night. I regard this statement as a fairly constructive, although not direct, response to our statement. This can be seen in that part of the statement of the Soviet Union which discusses the great significance of permanent and normal functioning of the economy and specifically the enterprises, and about the maintenance of economic ties between Lithuania and the Soviet Union so as to fulfill the contractual commitments and the production program for 1990, in a word, those we referred to in our appeal to the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, N. Ryzhkov. And in the same statement—although our document is not mentioned there, to say nothing of agreeing with it—we have reason to see a certain guarantee: That there will be no economic blockade—at least not open and official—since the Soviet Union itself expressed interest, even concern, in its words about maintaining economic ties. This is fully in keeping with our statement. I would like to regard the concern for normal functioning of the transportation lines the same way, for we are also interested in that. If the Soviet Union could help us technically it would be to the advantage of both sides. This pertains to transportation between Kaliningrad Oblast and the port of Klaypeda. And we ourselves have repeatedly spoken of this and said that during the forthcoming negotiations with the Soviet Union we must be sure to take these interests of the Soviet Union into account. And so these are places where we agree. We need only establish that we agree. But it very well might happen that because of certain diplomatic and political difficulties, only this kind of exchange of coinciding opinions that are not formulated in a general document will continue. This statement from the government of the Soviet Union also contains incorrect points that are apparently based on false information very similar to that which is proclaimed at unity rallies. They talk as though we are in a great hurry to transfer state enterprises to private hands. We know that the leaflets and the resolution of the unity meeting contain the same falsehood that was proclaimed at the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee by Mikolas Burokyavichyus and subsequently by the commentators on Central Television: That we restored the 1938 Constitution and that was all there was to it. We returned the bourgeois system and that was it. This is how they use—I will not say for noble purposes—the procedure which we applied for a short period of time when symbolically emphasizing the continuity of the state. It is possible that this also deluded the USSR Council of Ministers which speaks of immediate and complete privatization of our industry. Its statement also mentions the increased protection of certain facilities. Just yesterday we received information from the nuclear power plant in Snechkus that strange new people had appeared there. Today Minister M. Misyukonis confirmed that there was an additional guard sent from the same department which is now checking on procedures at the nuclear power plant. We know that the main danger of the nuclear power plant consists in its design and the practice of poor planning and forced decisions that determined the construction of the nuclear power plant in that place. Certain things, of course, in this regard are irreversible, but we can see no other danger to the nuclear power plant except perhaps the actions of some crazy person. Protection from crazy people, if Moscow has decided that it should be increased, is a good thing.

Last night foreign agencies asked many questions and today will probably continue to ask what is meant by the fact that the USSR Committee for State Security has given additional instructions to check on customs in Lithuania. As you know, we took certain steps and adopted decrees concerning monitoring certain points in order to see whether material values were being transported out of Lithuania. And it was intended—apparently with the cooperation of border troops—to gradually begin performing control functions at the border crossing points. Perhaps the statement of the USSR Government thus indirectly emphasizes that the Lithuanian Republic will not be allowed to do this.

Apparently practice and certain direct contacts between the services will make it possible to clarify what these instructions mean.

A couple of other aspects of this statement can be understood as an extremely unique sign, a recognition of the new state status of the Lithuanian Republic. I see this in points where they strictly warn us against decisions which would violate the "unity of the country's financial and credit system," in other words, against the introduction of our own money. This question has been under discussion in Estonia and Lithuania for perhaps no less than a year but nobody has ever before come out against it so harshly and strictly and certainly not at such a high government level as now. I note the same thing where it is emphatically stated that all facilities under Union jurisdiction, as it says in this text, are Union property. Corrections to our constitution made almost a year ago now assert something different: Everything located on the territory of Lithuania is the property of the republic. Then too we heard an especially emphatic reaction that refutes this point of the Constitution. As you will recall, at that time it was suggested that Lithuania coordinate its constitutional amendments with the Union Constitution. Abolish our amendments, so to speak. Lithuania did not do this and no threats followed. And since the same questions which previously bothered few people are now being interpreted strictly and resolutely, I am drawing the conclusion that the USSR Government sees, feels, and in a certain way recognizes our new legal position. In any case there is considerably more concern about what I have just mentioned here. Regardless of how that may be, I regard this document as a kind of beginning or stage in negotiations, an exchange of opinions and points which sometimes contradict one another, show the incompatibility of our positions, and, in a number of cases, show their compatibility.

Yesterday, toward the end of the day, the people we delegated met in Moscow with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. This occurred at 1800 hours. Vaydotas Antanaytis and Egidinyus Bichkauskas spoke with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev for a half hour after handing him the letter signed by me which you know about and which we discussed here. As the delegates were informed, the USSR president read attentively (perhaps the government telegram with the identical text which we also sent that day had not yet reached him)—he read it more than once and the conversation with him was calm and businesslike. Our delegates drew attention to the fact that if there were complaints against Lithuania because of the radical and hasty nature of its decisions—this is approximately how I understand the permanent text—Egidiyus Bichkauskas had his say and reminded them of the lack of flexibility of the USSR leadership with respect to the interests of the republic during the entire past two-year period. And the remark of one of them to the effect that M.S. Gorbachev apparently had poor advisers on problems of national questions was not refuted, just as was the case a year ago in Moscow during the same kind of unofficial conversation when I had occasion to state that we had enough faith in M.S. Gorbachev but at the same time we saw that he was not being given good advice.

What should bother us and how should we react to each piece of information? Yesterday it was mentioned that certain staff people, apparently from the Council of Ministers in Moscow, were visiting enterprises under Union jurisdiction and that the purpose of their activity was unknown. We shall look behind all such phenomena, just as behind the possible movement of troops or other officials on the territory of Lithuania, and see the extent to which this reflects prospects for the practical application of the statement of the USSR Government and if this has anything to do with what it says about providing communications and whether this will be decided arbitrarily or in cooperation with the Lithuanian Republic. I hope that it will be the second variant.

Behind all this stands the main mistake of the USSR Government—it could be heard even in the decree of the Third Congress of People's Deputies, especially crudely in the part that discusses USSR sovereignty with respect to Lithuania. This sovereignty was not and is not recognized by a single democratic country of the world. Thus the Soviet Union is merely confirming its aggressive claims against Lithuania and nothing more. What was done in 1940 by completely different leaders of the Soviet Union they are now trying to reinforce with the signatures of the current leadership.

It was presumed that there would be a particular reaction from foreign states even yesterday; today it seems that Secretary of State Baker has already spoken with USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Shevardnadze about Lithuania, asking and in some way (we have still to learn about this) warning him about the nature and significance of his large troop movements in Lithuania. Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs Clark also addressed the USSR Embassy regarding this. Today we see that the aircraft are no longer flying and perhaps the maneuver assignment has been fulfilled.

M.S. Gorbachev, in a conversation with our delegates, noted that the question of Lithuania would be discussed the next night in the Presidential Council. It is a pity that we know nothing concrete about the results of this conference. Communications from foreign agencies are largely speculative and are based on the announcement of the USSR Government. And I do not wish to comment on them because they are not based on solid information.

Concerning what I noted as a mistake of the USSR Government upon forming relations and the assertion of the false sovereignty of the USSR with respect to Lithuania, I can say that in the 20th century we do not recognize legal principles such as the one who annexes declares himself to be the sovereign of the annexed region. "What I have taken by force is mine." This is from the Middle Ages and is not the law of the 20th century. The civilized world rejected such rights long ago.

Now about the political situation in Lithuania. We have information—you saw fragments and yesterday Leningrad television apparently showed all of the Yedinstva meeting in Vilnius. This program was quite justifiably cut by our committee for television and radio on the basis of the Law on the Press where it discusses statements of an inflammatory nature. The question arises: What should we do if inflammatory activity of this nature is carried on channels of Central Television and in the Moscow programming. There are always certain elements of falsehood and instigation, we have seen this and criticized it repeatedly, but it might be that we shall have to refuse to broadcast these programs. As concerns the programming of Leningrad television, about which there were great doubts even before—perhaps it would be worthwhile to discuss right now whether it is expedient to use this channel in this easy way.

We probably have nothing against seeing Polish television and possibly we should think not about mechanically filling up all the programming and not transmitting only Polish television all the time. We have discussed previously with the Union of Soviet Poles and with television workers what we should do so that part of the time is used in this way and part of it is used for other needs which augment our own Lithuanian programming. Thus we would also take into account the needs of other national communities and the viewers would be given more informational material about world culture and material of an educational nature. I am putting this out as an idea that could be discussed here or the appropriate commission could be instructed to discuss it. Suggestions should be submitted to the Council of Ministers or the Supreme Soviet. But it seems to me that for us it is considerably more expedient to see Polish programming from Warsaw that is truly not hostile to Lithuania than hostile programming from Leningrad. True, Leningrad has sometimes shown programs that are benevolent to Lithuania, that objectively elucidate the situation, but we are already aware of the situation ourselves. We can only be grateful when Leningrad uses any objectivity in informing the residents of Russia.

The participation of numerous Polish people in the demands proclaimed by Yedinstvo that Lithuania or some part of its territory separated from the republic remain in the USSR seems strange to me. When you compare this with the way political powers in Poland and simple people of various professions in that country are congratulating us—we have not received a single disapproving telegram or letter from there—one gets the impression that there are two Polish nations in the world. I am not saying this about all Poles in Lithuania but I would not like very much to have the impression created that they are all "individuals." It seems that our colleagues who are deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the Polish nationality in this situation should be more placating and not aggravate the present situation or one that is artificially inflamed. In fact, if one thinks about it, are these people who demand that a certain territory of Lithuania be included in Belorussia comparing the position of the Poles in Lithuania and Belorussia and do they wish well for the Poles? I do not understand this. After all, some of the Poles living in Belorussia who perhaps no longer speak Polish resettled in Lithuania—and this was a local migration involving quite a number of people—they moved to Lithuania because there are Polish schools here. Do they really want to "go back," taking our land with them? What a unique kind of gratitude for the fact that better conditions were created for the Poles in Lithuania... Today in these regions there is a great deal of unrest and many confusing instigations. And I very strongly urge our colleagues who are there and other activists who have influence in the Polish community to exert efforts so that the attempts to inflame hostility, which clearly play into the hands of a third force, do not produce results.

The Russian community, as we have seen from measures that have been taken and as we can see from our cooperation in general, includes both people who heartily support our decisions and those who are very hostile to them, and it is strange when the people who are hostile use out-and-out lies in their arguments. Even intelligent people with official titles. Apparently that is their understanding of ethics. But there are also a fairly large number of sober-minded people, and one of the manifestations of this sober attitude was the extraordinary session of the soviet of deputies organized yesterday in Snechkus. Only a small number of deputies demanded this session but it was enough so that it was held. Still, even there, as I was informed by telephone, sober reason triumphed and there was no support for the extremely provocative demands. One constantly repeated word remained—referendum. One can at least speak about this, of course, if this is the opinion of all residents of Lithuania and if there is a possibility of conducting a referendum not under conditions of occupation and military intimidation, if indeed this is still actually demanded. In principle we have already said what we have to say and no referendum is needed to corroborate our decisions. I do not mind repeating the arguments on which our position is based. But I wish to remind those who are demanding a referendum of the conditions under which such a state referendum could be conducted and here, possibly, suggest that before this referendums be held in the Russian Federation or in the Ukraine or somewhere else: Do those people want socialism?

And in conclusion, let me discuss what we are doing and how we are communicating and cooperating among ourselves and how we look from the outside. Today's KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, not being able to figure out what is happening here, writes that Sajudis, having taken over power, has switched its entire press from the opposition to support. When that happened I did not notice that our press had changed. But I did notice, as, incidentally, others have also noted, that, as before, Sajudis has practically no central press of its own. There is a weekly and various other publications that reflect the pluralism of the "press" proclaimed and realized by Sajudis. But from the outside, for people who are not oriented in the situation, it looks as though and

they say that the "criticizing side" has numerous weak interfront publications, and all the Communist Party has left is TIESA. An extremely strange comparison. You read and it is not clear: Either it is done deliberately so as to delude people as to what and where the "Communist Party" is—is it the opposition or is it on the same side, criticizing along with the interfront publications the way things really are. It is interesting how in Moscow they note all kinds of trivia and print cartoons. I did not even notice the cartoon from RESPUBLIKA but here is what they say about it: Some kind of maestro at a grand piano with puppets dancing around him. KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA is happy to note that there is a certain measure of truth in this cartoon, saying that parliament consists only of advocates of Sajudis. This is not true. But if it were true it would be the expression of the will of the voters. And there are no puppets. In a word, this is an example of how a certain opinion is created, how they placate themselves. Thus they publish speeches from the West German parliament which is trying, as before, to degrade us and persuade us to remain in the USSR federation. And at the same time we know that the attitude of the West German public toward Lithuania has changed significantly. As people living there say—this is wrong. Previously the attitude was conservative: not to offend Mr. Gorbachev who is loved by everybody there. But now they have come to love Lithuania too, and even more.

Permit me to conclude my remarks with this. Once again I invite those who have gathered here and listened to me to achieve civic awareness. Let your personal discussions remain among yourselves and leave no room for interpretations that Lithuania is in political or any other kind of chaos. As we can see, this is not the case. And this probably especially irritates those who oppose our decisions. But what can we do.

Prunskiene Sends Congratulations to Gorbachev

90UN1293D Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 16 Mar 90 p 1

[Message to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev from K. Prunskiene on behalf of the government of the Lithuanian Republic]

[Text] To His Excellency Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

We cordially congratulate you on your election to the post of president of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and sincerely wish you further success in your tireless activities to ensure democracy, glasnost, the inalienable rights of peoples, the prosperity of the USSR, and to build the common European home.

We hope that you will show sensitivity and good will with regard to the decisions of a sovereign Lithuania. The government of the Lithuanian Republic desires to maintain stable and mutually advantageous relations with the USSR, and is counting on reciprocity.

On behalf of the Government of the Lithuanian Republic, K. PRUNSKIENE, 15 March 1990

Decree on Lithuanian Commissions Published

90UN1293E Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian in Russian 16 Mar 90 p 3

[Lithuanian Supreme Soviet decree: "On Permanent Commissions of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] The Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet **resolves**:

To form the following permanent commissions:

Credentials and Ethics Commission;
Commission for Restoring the State;
Judicial System Commission;
Commission for Protecting the State and Internal Affairs;
Foreign Affairs Commission;
Education, Science, and Culture Commission;
Environmental Protection Commission;
Economic Commission;
Budget Commission;
Commission for Health Care and Social Issues;
Commission for the Rights of Citizens and Nationalities Affairs;
Commission for Self-Government Affairs.

[signed] Chairman of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet V. LANDSBERGIS
Vilnius, 14 March 1990

Landsbergis Sends Open Letters to Officials

To Gorbachev

90UN1342F Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 14 Mar 90 p 1

["Letter to the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, His Excellency Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev" published under the rubric: "First Session of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic of the First Convocation"]

[Text] We deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic who have been democratically chosen through the free expression of the will of the people of Lithuania, having striven for decades to restore our country's state independence, announce to you that the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic on 11 March 1990 adopted a number of legislative acts and political decisions that establish the restoration of the independent Lithuanian state.

The texts of the documents are appended.

We express the hope that you personally and the leadership of the Soviet Union as a whole will be understanding and benevolent with respect to the decisions we

have adopted and that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will recognize the restored independent Lithuanian Republic.

We request that you consider the present appeal to be an official proposal to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to begin negotiations concerning the regulation of all issues related to the restoration of an independent Lithuanian state.

We hope that you will give especially serious attention to the safety of the young men of Lithuania who are in the USSR Armed Forces at the present time.

We wish to maintain permanent good political and economic relations with the USSR and hope for the same position and benevolence from you.

With sincere respect from the
[Signed] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic, V. LANDSBERGIS, Vilnius, 12 March 1990

To Ryzhkov

90UN1342G Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 14 Mar 90 p 1

[Letter "To the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Mr. N. Ryzhkov" published under the rubric: "First Session of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic of the First Convocation"]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic, having restored the Lithuanian state on 11 March 1990, proposes to the Government of the USSR to maintain existing economic ties and be guided by existing commitments until such time as economic relations between the Lithuanian Republic and the USSR are determined by bilateral agreements.
[signed] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic, V. LANDSBERGIS, Vilnius, 12 March 1990

Vilnius Residents Discuss Recent Situation

LD0404163390 Moscow TASS in English 1601 GMT 4 Apr 90

[By TASS special correspondent Nikolay Zehjezhov and Pyotr Cheremushkin]

[Text] Vilnius April 4 TASS—We have been in Vilnius for three days and all these days we have heard, like all residents of Lithuania, this call broadcast over the radio: Do not turn off your wireless for the night not to miss the moment when the Soviet Army enters the city...

We have no idea who initiated this call, a young radio journalist seeking to mark the outset of his career by some memorable trick or a grey-haired member of the newly established Lithuanian Television and Radio Board. One thing, however, can be stated with certainty--no one has yet been called to account for this refined piece of malicious insult to millions of people, for the deliberate disruption of their peaceful rest at night.

The syndrome of "great power intervention" in the internal affairs of the Lithuanian state is, perhaps, the most precise description of the massive ideological indoctrination with which the Sajudis leaders have filled all the press. The front pages of many papers carry banners: The Strong Neighbor Recognizes No Compromise, Terrorists (describing the capture of deserters hiding in hospitals), the Lithuanian Customs Reject Diarchy, and the like. In addition, every day begins with a portion of intimidation—morning programs of local television begin with the same footage showing the military machinery rolling through Vilnius on their way to exercises in the northern districts of the republic. A close-up of track- prints on the asphalt. An escalation of anxiety is the only name for this morning "blessing" from television screens, while no law has been adopted to halt it. Not a single newspaper—not a single one, except for SOVETSKAYA LITVA published outside the republic,—said a word against the hysteria, or appealed to common sense, to a sober assessment of the grave situation here, even after the president addressed the people of the Lithuanian Republic and the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet.

On the contrary, members of the republican Supreme Soviet have endorsed numerous notes, statements and appeals to the governments of all countries and international organizations, soliciting support, interference, protection.

The fraternal republic of Lithuania was defended by the Soviet people in 1941 and supported very dependably last year. USSR people's deputies found it expedient to promulgate, among the first acts at their first Supreme Soviet session, a law on Lithuania's economic independence. "Lithuania without sovereignty—Lithuania without a future" is a slogan displayed everywhere in Vilnius. But its implications are viewed differently by different people. Who stands to gain from making the two locomotives collide which were destined, by history itself, to move ahead together?

Let us ask those who are seeking an answer here in these alarming days. The square in front of the opera house is filled with people, not a single one without a newspaper. A newspaper stall nearby sells nearly a dozen of daily newspapers. A middle-aged man readily responds to our greetings and to the question which newspaper he considers his own.

"IZVESTIYA is the newspaper for me," he replies in Russian with a slight Polish accent. "I always read it first and then look through the Lithuanian newspapers to see if they have not regained their senses and turned to face the people. But no one seems to be willing to recognize that the present leadership of the republic has brought the situation to an impasse by their hasty actions and laws.

"Please do not publish my surname," Vladislav O. asked. "The law on responsibility for anti-state calls has not yet been promulgated but the bill is already doing what it should not—people are afraid to speak their mind, those who disagree get threatening telephone calls, their doors are nailed too. It is not hard to guess who does it all.

Our conversation with philology student Algis Japonis was brief.

"Young people are feeling fine," he said and pointed to the familiar slogan at the entrance to the square, the slogan explaining what lack of sovereignty means to Lithuania.

"Was there no sovereignty in the republic before March 11?"

"I don't think there was. Well, anyway, let the government think about these things."

"Do you turn on your radio before going to bed?"

"What do you mean? Oh, I see. But it is a joke."

There are jokes and jokes. At first, someone decided to play a practical joke by sending soldiers, who were drafted for service in the Soviet Army here in Lithuania, letters hinting that they were in the wrong, foreign army and advising them to flee as best they could. This joke was followed by a serious parliamentary step. Just a few deputies warned the republican Supreme Soviet against taking this blunder vis-a-vis the Soviet Union and the Soviet Constitution. The session adopted by a majority a resolution that put to shame not only Lithuanian, Polish and Russian young men who joined the Soviet Army from Lithuania, but also their fathers and grandfathers.

A deserter will always be a deserter: since it unilaterally proclaimed itself independent on March 11 Lithuania tempted more than 1,000 of its sons to desert. In the name of the republican supreme body of authority they were told to leave the Army and promised shelter in temples and hospitals. Thus, not only the republican "free press" but also its supreme legislature uses regulatory enactments to fan separatist attitudes and push people towards confrontation with federal laws.

"The parliament should not be used to make ill-considered appeals," war veteran V.Zemis said about this "act of state".

There is hardly any other parliament in the world which would dare to dishonor young citizens in this way, young citizens who joined the Soviet Army to do their national duty and were quite unexpectedly told they had joined an occupational army, as it looked in the terms of the Lithuanian bourgeois Constitution, which the newly-elected Supreme Soviet regards as the basis of Lithuania's state independence. These words belong to V. Balciunas, a man made wise not only by the 80 years he has lived here but also by the memory of that independent Lithuania which is now being copied by new law-makers, representing not a movement but the new ruling Sajudis party.

We may be rebuked by some people for paying too much attention to senior citizens, people endowed with good memory and good hearts, during our tour of the city which appeared so calm outwardly but was as tense as a spring behind the facade. V.Zemis, awarded many war orders for valor, and V. Balciunis, one-time farm laborer and now a renowned builder, as also thousands of people like them, recognised perestroyka as a path leading towards freedom for Lithuania within the union of equal and free republics.

They cannot become easy prey for the temptation to act in the name of another freedom—freedom to make proclamations "on behalf of the people" while ignoring the prospective responsibility for these steps.

The Soviet president reminded the republican Supreme Soviet about this responsibility, he appealed to the hearts and minds of Lithuania's residents. What will prevail—reason or the persistence of those, who needed popular support only as long as the elections lasted—will be made clear in the next few days.

Public Opinion Center Conducts Poll in Vilnius

LD0504114490 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2130 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] In the first few days of April, the public opinion center in Vilnius conducted a poll, the first such study since the declaration of independence on 11 March. As always, 1,500 respondents were chosen to give a proportional representation of Lithuania's national composition and basic age group.

The main point in the questionnaire was worded as follows: How do you assess the act of independence declared by parliament on 11 March? Only nine percent of those polled were categorically against it. In other words, 91 percent of the respondents can be termed as full supporters of Lithuania's independence. True, for objectivity's sake it must be admitted that the positive answer has two alternatives. The first alternative is full approval and 60 percent expressed their unconditional agreement. The second alternative positive reply was worded as follows: I support the idea of Lithuanian independence in principle, but I think it is a bit early, or there are some other motives. Thirty-one percent of positive responses belonged to this latter category. A very important point to be mentioned here is the attitude of Lithuanians as opposed to non-Lithuanians. Quite naturaly, non-Lithuanians seem to be more reserved in their evaluation. However, two-thirds of the non-Lithuanian population support the idea of the reestablishment of the Lithuanian state.

One might wonder whether this figure reflects the real situation. Eighteen percent of non-Lithuanians polled

agreed unconditionally to independence, yet the greater majority opted for the second alternative of the positive answer.

However, among Lithuanian respondents only three percent turned out to be categorically opposed to Lithuania's independence. Among non- Lithuanians this figure was 10 times higher.

This reflects quite a pronounced confrontation on this issue betwen Lithuanians and non-Lithuanians.

For the first time our respondents were asked to name the countries which, in their opinion, were favorably disposed to Lithuania. The polled were free to choose one country. As expected, our best friends turned out to be Estonia and Latvia, our closest neighbors who are also striving for independence. Next comes Poland. This was influenced by the positive activities of the Polish parliament with respect to Lithuania. Also among the list of friendly countries is the United States. However, the Soviet Union and Russia are rated as the most unfriendly nations.

As usual, the respondents were asked to devise a list of 10 most popular personalities. It amazed researchers for its relative stability. Firmly in first place was Algirdas Brazauskas, mentioned by 60 percent of those polled. The popularity of Vytautas Landsbergis, who is chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, has rocketed from 12 percent to 45 percent. As before, the Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene retained the same position.

The figure of Mikhail Gorbachev was also considered. It is no secret that all over the world the Soviet president is valued as a highly reputed statesman. He is also extremely popular in Lithuania as the initiator of the democratization process and national rebirth. It must also be admitted that Gorbachev had a better rating in Lithuania than in Russia. In an evaluation system ranging from minus 100 to plus 100, Gorbachev had a plus 40 to plus 50 rating in Lithuania last year. Following his visit to Lithuania early in January, his prestige was boosted.

How do things stand today? Mikhail Gorbachev's popularity in Lithuania has now dropped to minus 28. This, undoubtedly, comes as a direct result of the recent statements and appeals made by Gorbachev on the Lithuanian independence issue. Until now only the pro-Moscow Communist Party in Lithuania received such a low mark. Could this be seen as a new sensation?

Papers Publish Workers' Letters on Lithuania

LD0504110490 Moscow TASS in English 1024 GMT 5 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 5 TASS—Soviet central newspapers are being flooded with letters and telegrams from Soviet people, concerned by the situation in Lithuania.

A letter signed by 13 workers of the Vilnius Vilma Production Amalgamation is published today in PRAVDA. The letter expresses full support for the Soviet president's address to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet on the immediate cancellation of the illegal acts. "We do not recognise laws that run counter to the Soviet Constitution," noted the letter.

"Lithuanians must decide what to do by themselves in accordance with their legitimate rights for self-determination and sovereignty. There should be no hurry or excitement," Valentina Ishkova, a worker from the Stavropol Lyuminofor Amalgamation in the Northern Caucasus, writes:

"To my mind, it was persuasively proved in the Soviet president's address to the Lithuanian people. Wariness is needed. I call on everyone who is not indifferent to the future of Lithuania to be wary."

The SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA newspaper noted that President Gorbachev has again called for wisdom and responsibility in these difficult days. The only response to these calls is defiant statements by Sajudis leaders on behalf of all Lithuanian people.

Sajudis members are reconstructing a society of social inequality and breaking economic, political and social ties between Soviet peoples. Pursuing their personal careerist goals, they are consciously driving the republic and its people towards catastrophe and in the progress, dooming workers to unemployment, suffering and hardship.

The situation in Lithuania has been aggravated by the spring draft campaign, declared by a decree of the Soviet Council of Ministers of March 29, 1990, the RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA newspaper notes.

Having cancelled the Soviet law "on universal military duty" on Lithuaniam territory, the republican Supreme Soviet put many young men and their families in a difficult situation. Whom should they obey? Shall they go to recruiting offices or not?

"It is evident that each people has the right to self-determination—love cannot be forced," writes Inna Artemyeva, construction engineer from Leningrad.

"The same is true with the current situation in Lithuania: the possible turn of events will affect the destinies of millions of citizens and may seriously damage the economy of an already ruined state.

"Interethnic problems are solved at the negotiating table in every country on the basis of law, not by confrontation," she added.

Lithuanian Deputy on Creating Defense System

LD0504112690 Moscow World Service in Russian 0934 GMT 5 Apr 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program; report attributed to INTERFAX]

[Text] Independent Lithuania wishes to be a neutral state and has no territorial claims against its neighbors, stated Zigmas Vaisvila, chairman of the Supreme Council of Lithuania Commission for the Defense of the Country and Internal Affairs, in an interview with a correspondent of the agency. He noted that a series of draft laws envisaging the creation of a defense system of the country is now in the parliamentlary commissions. According to Vaisvila, the creation of forces to defend the borders, maintain law and order, and guard secret institutions is envisaged. Replying to a question on Sajudis' creation of detachments for the defense of the country, the commission's chairman stressed that it is merely a matter of registering volunteers. No military training whatsoever is being carried out, he reported.

However, Algirdas Kumza, a member of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and deputy of the republic's Supreme Council, stated in an interview with an INTERFAX correspondent, that the independent Lithuanian Communist Party adheres to a policy aimed at moderate progress toward an independent Lithuanian state. However, supporters of this viewpoint lost at the elections and during the first days of the parliament's work, he noted. Now, Kumza said, we do not always want to oppose the parliament but by doing so, we cause a split in its activity.

In his words, the disagreement between the Lithuanian Communist Party and Sajudis lies not in the aim of the restoration of an independent Lithuanian state, but in the pace and means of achieving this aim. Time will show whose viewpoint is more promising, stressed Kumza. He noted that for the relations between Vilnius and Moscow to be settled, a dialogue must be started as soon as possible. However, Kumza stated, the Lithuanian parliament's renunciation of the acts to restore independence is impossible.

Cost of Lithuanian Withdrawal From USSR Viewed

90UN1087A Moscow SOYUZ in Russian No 8, 19-25 Feb 90 p 8

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent L. Kapelyushnyy under the rubric "What Withdrawal From the USSR May Cost Lithuania": "Before You Close the Door..."]

[Text] Demands for withdrawal from the USSR have become something of a political fashion. No matter to whom you listen, everyone is separating, everyone is trying on sovereignty. As opposed to many, Lithuania has begun a sober evaluation of such a step. A few days ago the Lithuanian Council of Ministers discussed a proposed model of economic development for an independent republic. If we use parliamentary terminology, a "first reading" took place...

It is not possible for me to relate the entire three-hour discussion. But for the first time in Lithuania, the widespread idea of withdrawal from the Soviet Union was evaluated and measured in rubles and dollars, tons of oil, and kilowatts of electricity. To be free and hungry is not the worst that could happen, but what if famine and poverty drive the republic into a new lack of freedom? Little Lithuania, deprived of sources of raw material, rarely able to make ends meet in the economic model, stands today before a difficult decision.

In essence, there are not many choices. And if we proceed from all that has been said, then Lithuania's future can be oriented toward the West, which is alluring and suits the disposition of many people, or toward the East. That is, the Soviet Union. The latter does not please many people, but circumstances are stronger than passions or desires...

Speaking honestly, I do not envy the prime minister of a Lithuania "free" of the economy of the Soviet Union. It is not even that someone will intentionally cut off the notorious "pipeline" for oil and gas in order to "teach a lesson" to the Lithuanians for their disobedience. Personally I rule out the possibility of such petty vengeance. With whom will we trade if not with our closest neighbors? The problem lies elsewhere: The transition from Soviet prices to world prices will immediately make a breach in the republic's budget on a magnitude of billions of dollars just in one sector alone—fuel and energy resources. And how else can it be if their own, Lithuanian, resources—peat and firewood—account for only three percent? Incidentally, that is only the beginning of the account. Light industry, whose products are so popular in the country, is based for the most part on imported raw materials. Cotton costs Lithuania R3 per kilogram. On the world market that same item can cost $20.00 at times. There is a difference between R30 and $70.00 for a ton of oil. It seems that they do not have enough of their own grain to support production of meat and milk at today's levels. In good years the republic only harvests 3.5 million tons of grain, and 4.5 million tons are needed at the very least.

It has turned out that the Lithuanians do not have enough arable land. If you are going to increase production of grain, you need hectares. If you want to produce timber—to plant and grow trees- then you also need hectares. If you want to orient yourself away from cotton materials and toward flax (and there is some sense in this because flax was held in high regard in bourgeois Lithuania and products made from flax were exported), you need land for this too.

Of additional significance is the following: Lithuania, considering itself one of the most developed of our republics, is rather backward in comparison with its western neighbors, on whom it needs to orient itself. If it

takes 20 kilograms of fuel per resident to heat a square meter of housing in Finland, it takes 60 kilograms in Lithuania. If the Swedes need three kilograms of fertilizer for a quintal of wheat, Lithuania needs seven. Lithuania spends twice as much on production of pork as Denmark does. I bring all this up because in that great bazaar which is the European market, where all the scales were bought up and all the stalls taken long ago, there is always someone whose goods are better and cheaper.

While we all live in one big family we are not always all aware that each enjoys the wealth of a huge state. It is a different thing when that wealth is used extremely badly, carelessly, or clumsily. But if it is worth leaving and closing the door behind oneself, then problems of a qualitatively different sort begin.

The economic model was adopted at the first reading. Now it will undergo national discussion. For the first time in two years of meetings the citizens of Lithuania will have to put aside their flags and placards and, taking up their pencils, calculate.

Prunskiene Views Economic Ties with Moscow

PM2003161490 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 19 Mar 90 p 7

[Report on interview with Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene by Flemming Rose; date, place not specified: "The West Lacks Courage"]

[Text] Lithuania—"The West's cautious reaction to Lithuania's independence deprives President Gorbachev of an important trump card in his endeavors to democratize the Soviet Union," Lithuania's newly elected prime minister, Kazimiera Prunskiene, told BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in her first interview after her election.

"The West's reticence helps neither us nor Gorbachev. Now Gorbachev cannot say to the antidemocratic members of the People's Congress that the rest of the world supports Lithuanian independence. Instead the world is waiting for the outcome of Gorbachev's confrontation with the dark forces [den sorte masse].

"I have been to negotiations in Moscow several times and there I understood that it is not wholly correct simply to put pressure on Gorbachev. We must address our criticism more directly—to Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Maslyukov. So Gorbachev has arguments against the conservatives. We leave it to Gorbachev to fight with the dark forces, and this is exactly what the world is doing in the case of Lithuania.

"We would have liked to see the West, including Denmark, react more courageously."

Prunskiene is Lithuania's first woman prime minister. She is called the "Iron Lady" by the mass of the people—a description about which she is not particularly enthusiastic. Prunskiene is 47 and a professor of economics. Behind her she has a past as a member of the Communist Party and since September 1989 she has been the driving force behind Lithuania's economic reform program. Prunskiene is a member of the top leadership of Sajudis, the nationalist movement, alongside President Landsbergis and Deputy Prime Minister Romualdas Ozolas.

Prunskiene is confident that Gorbachev will use his increased powers to begin realistic negotiations with the newly elected Lithuanian leadership.

"We have had several conversations with Gorbachev on the Baltic republics' role in Europe after 1992, and he is very interested in developments. I have told him several times that we can only fulfill our role as a link between Europe and the Soviet Union if we are independent."

But it is one thing to declare independence, and something else actually to achieve it. Nevertheless, the new prime minister takes a confident view of the future:

"Our political independence has stimulated the interest of Western investors, even though we are seven to 10 years behind the West technologically. The most important thing for us in the present situation is to modernize our industry and technology as quickly as possible. And for this purpose we will have to attract capital. This will be acheived through the privatization of state-owned enterprises.

"We plan to sell enterprises, lease land and buildings, and sell apartments and workshops."

Prunskiene takes the view that this will be the quickest way to make Lithuania's currency convertible. And before the end of March the Lithuanian government will decide on a return to the country's old currency, the litas.

"The Soviet ruble will be withdrawn from circulation. In our new trade agreements with Moscow we envisage that to begin with the litas will be worth one ruble. The privatization of Lithuanian industry will quickly cause the litas to rise in value. That was what happened in the twenties when Lithuania became independent."

Prunskiene disagrees with those who claim that Lithuania will be economically dependent on the Soviet Union for a long time to come.

"Those who say this equate economic independence with self-sufficiency. They have forgotten that there is something called the exchange of goods in foreign trade. Raw materials from Russia and other Soviet republics are not a sign of independence [sentence as published]. You just need to look at the rest of the world, where it is common for things to work the other way around. The country which manufactures the finished product has a higher standard of living than the country that supplies the raw materials.

"Our present dependence on the Soviet Union is the result of ailing economic ties which cannot be described

as normal. But now that we have become independent there will also be changes in economic relations with Moscow. There will now be bilateral agreements, and not the coercion which has dominated our relations hitherto.

"If Moscow allows itself to be ruled by reason and not by emotions, economic cooperation will be to the advantage of both sides.

"We have cement that has been exported abroad without our receiving payment for it. We produce meat and dairy products, and at present half of these go to other parts of the Soviet Union. We have energy and a port which could be an important trading route to the Soviet Union. So all in all we have something to offer the Soviet Union when we come to holding negotiations about future cooperation," Prunskiene said smiling, before she hurried off to yet another meeting.

In the last two years she has not had a day off, and it does not look as if there will be time for one in the near future, given the many tasks facing the new head of government.

Paper Denies Lithuanian Claim to East Prussia

FM2003153190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Mar 90 First Edition p 4

[Article by A. Gorbatov in response to reader's letter: "Grand Plans For 'Lesser Lithuania'"; first two paragraphs are text of reader's letter]

[Text] "I heard recently in an All-Union Radio broadcast that a public movement has been set up in Lithuania or, at any rate, there is a group of people who regard Kaliningrad Oblast as a "lesser Lithuania" and on that basis are making territorial claims on the neighboring republic—the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. Can they be serious?
"O. Volskaya, Kharkov."

Yes, our reader is right. The idea of a "lesser Lithuania" supposedly located on the territory of Kaliningrad Oblast and other claims on the "Lithuanians' ethnic homeland" in the republic are to be heard with increasing frequency these days. I will corroborate this by acquainting PRAVDA readers with a recent item in the weekly REPUBLIKA, published by "Sajudis."

"A Corridor to the Baltic—Is it Really A Serious Idea?" That was the title of an article by Zh. Simanavichyus. Beginning with a discourse on the current improvement in the political climate, the author swiftly moved on to the idea of the possible conclusion of a treaty involving the USSR (or RSFSR), Lithuania, and Poland on the transfer of all ports on the Baltic to the Baltic republics. Zh. Simanavichyus proposes a commercial payment for the transportation of some USSR freight by rail and via ports in the Baltic republics.

Then the author of the bold plan hurriedly points out that the RSFSR currently has its own port of Leningrad on the Baltic; but that is not enough, of course, therefore it should be allowed to construct yet another port in...the present Kaliningrad Oblast, in its most southwesterly part—with access to the Baltic via the Gulf of Gdansk. East of this port, as far as Belorussia, you could mark off a narrow area along the border between Kaliningrad Oblast and Poland, on which Russia could lay a highway and railroad to its port.

"First the corridor from the port would follow the southern edge of Kaliningrad Oblast. A strip of land in this area could even be handed over to Poland. To avoid the sharp corner at the Lithuanian border on the outskirts of Galdupe, it would have to turn southeast and cut Suwalki, Augustow, and other ethnically Lithuanian territories off from Poland, reaching the Belorussian border southwest of Grodno, where you already have the railroad and highway from Moscow to Poland via Minsk.

"In this way a not-so-ancient grievance could be rectified: UN recognition of the Suvalkija and Augustavas territories, seized by the Poles after World War I, and, perhaps, part of the Baltstoge territory as belonging to Lithuania. For the return of the captured lands Poland could even get compensation—the aforementioned patch of territory in the southern part of Kaliningrad Oblast—if the corridor were shifted somewhat in a northerly direction, away from the present Polish border, in the relevant places.

"Kaliningrad Oblast can no longer be left as a colony of the RSFSR, since the colonial times are past. The only people entitled to inherit this ethnic land of the Prussians are brothers of that family—the Lithuanians.

"Belorussia and the Ukraine could have independent access to the Baltic by the same corridor or by an expanded and divided corridor (with a second highway and railroad).

"Lithuania's initiative on giving not only Russia, but also Belorussia and the Ukraine direct access to the Baltic could interest the latter and secure their support for the project. This would strengthen real peoples' friendship even more and help solve yet another problem—the restoration of the just ethnic and state border between Lithuania and Belorussia, which was defined and approved by Lenin's signature on the 12 July 1920 peace treaty between Lithuania and Russia."

The author's passage from the remote Middle Ages to the 21st century is so swift and unexpected that only someone with an expert knowledge of the subject would be able to comprehend the logic. So our correspondent asked Doctor of Historical Sciences E. Fedosova, a leading academic at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of USSR History, and Candidate of Historical Sciences S. Myakushev, a senior academic staffer, to comment on the RESPUBLIKA article:

"Without even assessing the political and economic significance of Zh. Simanavichyus' proposal on creating a special port for the RSFSR, the Ukraine, and Belorussia in Kaliningrad Oblast, it should first of all be

pointed out that the article's author is completely ignorant of the present economic status of the Baltic ports and transport arteries.

"And what about Zh. Simanavichyus' historical and ethnic claims? Before discussing them, we think that readers should be reminded about the formation of the modern territory of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR].

"Bourgeois statehood came about in Lithuania in the post-October period in conditions of which German forces occupied Lithuanian land. There were no firm state borders at the time. Given the very tense relations with the Polish state, the question of the eastern and southern regions was extremely acute. The proclamation of the Lithuanian-Belorussian SSR did not alter the situation, since the republic's capital—Vilnius—had been captured by Polish legionnaires on 21 April 1919 and the Red Army had been unsuccessful in its efforts to retrieve the lost territories. The Lithuanian bourgeois government could not do anything either. Soviet-Lithuanian talks began in 1920 and culminated on 12 July in the signing of a treaty by the RSFSR (but not by Belorussia) with the Lithuanian Democratic Republic. And the treaty was signed not by Lenin, but by A. Ioffe, Yu. Markhlevskiy, and L. Obolenskiy.

"The treaty defined the Soviet-Lithuanian border in the most radical way, since Molodechno, Oshmyany, Lida, and Grodno were incorporated into Lithuania. Vilno province was also transferred to the Lithuanian state. The treaty was prepared and signed at a time when the Red Army was driving the White Poles westward and the Lithuanian side noted during the signing ceremony that it would not object if the Red Army were to remain on Lithuanian territory. It was on 14 July that G. Gay's Third Cavalry Corps took Vilnius.

"But the course of the Soviet-Polish war turned in Poland's favor. When the Soviet forces retreated the White Poles retook Vilno Kray in 1920. The signing of the Riga Treaty with Poland on 12 October 1920 left the solution of territorial disputes in the hands of Poland and Lithuania.

"The entente of 1919 had proclaimed the transfer of Vilnius to Lithuania. Although there was no actual connection between the decisions, the French-administered Memel province (formerly part of Germany) was handed over to Lithuania. Memel became Klaipeda.

"In March 1939 Hitler forced the Smetona regime to return Klaipeda province to Germany. The republic's territory was again reduced to its 1920 dimensions. Then the tumultous events of August-September 1939 significantly changed the situation. Following the signing of the Soviet-German documents in 1939 and the German Wehrmacht's invasion of Poland the Red Army occupied eastern parts of Poland that had a predominantly Belorussian and Ukrainian population. On 10 October 1939 a treaty was also signed between the USSR and Lithuania. Together with the Red Army garrisons (this should not be forgotten either) Lithuania got Vilno province, but with new borders, not incorporating the area from Grodno to Molodechno.

"On 3 August 1940, the day the Lithuanian SSR was accepted into the USSR, its territory was increased by the addition of Svyantsyanskiy Rayon and parts of Vidzovskiy, Godutishkovskiy, Ostrovetskiy, Voronovskiy, and Radunskiy Rayons of the Belorussian SSR's Baranovichi and Vileyskaya Oblasts, where the population was predominantly Lithuanian. The current attitude in Lithuania toward the 1939 Soviet-German documents and the 3 August 1940 USSR Law is well known. But to declare these documents invalid is objectively to renounce the territory that was acquired as a result of them.

"The borders of the Lithuanian SSR finally took shape after the Great Patriotic War, when Klaipeda province was incorporated.

"As for the ethnic history of Eastern Europe, it is a series of tragic disappearances of entire ethnic groups, their assimilation and absorption, and the ousting of one ethnic group by another. For example, the Prussians put up heroic resistance to German aggression carried out by the Teutonic Knights. They repeatedly rose up against enslavement, but were largely destroyed, and their lands were occupied by settlers from German principalities. Those who survived were, in effect, fully assimilated, adopting the German language and culture. In 1945 there was practically no population left in war-ravaged East Prussia.

"It must be said quite categorically that Lithuanian statehood is secondary as far as many of the population centers mentioned in the article are concerned. Indeed, the expansion of the Grand Principality of Lithuania incorporated extensive areas of land with no Lithuanian population at all. But none of these 500-year-old borders now exists. Moreover, the areas of the cities of Suwalki, Awgustow, and Bialystok were not in the Lithuanian state even in its heyday.

"In making claims on land that was formerly part of the Grand Principality of Lithuania or was populated by related peoples, the author painstakingly uses the Lithuanian names of cities. As is known, in the days of Czar Aleksey Mikhaylovich the Russians called Stockholm Stekolnaya, which did not make it a Russian city. Can one expect a different result by calling Koenigsberg Karaliaucius?

"By following the logic of the article's author and those who support these views, one ends up not only redrawing the borders of USSR union republics, but also revising Poland's eastern borders. And, consequently, revising the results of World War II. This kind of approach is hardly like to inspire the United Nations, on which the author is pinning so much hope."

Lithuanian Local Soviet Election Results Reviewed

90UN1375A Moscow TRUD in Russian 30 Mar 90 p 1

[Report by G. Konchyus (Vilnius): "Republic Election Results"]

[Text] Only a month has passed since the elections to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet when, as we know, the majority of mandates were received by candidate deputies who were supported by Sajudis. Has the mood of the voters changed in this complicated political situation? Whom did they prefer to see as deputies to the local self-management organs?

Now that Sajudis is a political trend it is increasingly being divided into various political parties, and all those participating in the elections can be divided into three groups. The litmus test for determining their political leanings is their attitude toward the issue of Lithuanian independence. Representatives of the majority of new and resurrected parties—Social Democrats, Christian Democrats, "Greens"—are in favor of the immediate restoration of Lithuania's independence. This is essentially the position of Sajudis. Members of the independent Communist Party of Lithuania are also proponents of independence for the republic but they see the realization of this idea as a process and not as a one- time act. Communists on the platform of the CPSU are in favor of retaining Lithuania as a part of the renewed Federation of the USSR.

It will be necessary to elect a total of 9,331 deputies to the local soviets. In the first round they elected 7,088. Of these 2,432 are in favor of the position of an independent Communist Party of Lithuania; 428 were members of the Communist Party of Lithuania (on the platform of the CPSU). The rest represent other parties and movements.

Among the deputies that were elected, 85 percent are Lithuanians, 12 percent Poles, and two percent Russians. Employees comprise 48 percent, collective farm workers 40 percent, and laborers 10 percent.

The positions of the Communist Party of Lithuania (on the platform of the CPSU) are strongest in Shalchininskiy, Shvenchenskiy, and Vilnyusskiy Rayons. They have the majority in these soviets. In other rural rayons and cities under republic jurisdiction the majority are representatives of other parties.

Council Issues Decree on State Borders

90UN357D Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 22 Mar 90 p 2

[Decree of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic on the Designation of State Borders of Lithuania]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic hereby decrees:

To make it incumbent on the Council of Ministers of the Lithuanian Republic to begin preparatory work on the designation of the state borders of Lithuania.

[Signed] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic, V. LANDSBERGIS, Vilnius, 20 March 1990

Council Voids USSR Law on Conscription

90UN1342J Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 14 Mar 90 p 2

["Decree of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic on the Invalidity of the USSR Law on Universal Military Obligation of 12 October 1967 on the Territory of the Lithuanian Republic" published under the rubric: "First Session of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic of the First Convocation"]

[Text] In keeping with Article 3 of the law of the Lithuanian Republic of 11 March 1990, "On the Temporary Basic Law of the Lithuanian Republic," the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic clarifies that the USSR law on "Universal Military Obligation of 12 October 1967" is invalid with respect to citizens of the Lithuanian Republic.

[Signed] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic, V. LANDSBERGIS, Vilnius, 12 March 1990

Council Declares Restoration of 1938 Constitution

90UN1342E Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 14 Mar 90 p 1

["Law of the Lithuanian Republic on Reinstatement of the Constitution of Lithuania of 12 May 1938" published under the rubric: "First Session of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic of the First Convocation"]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic:

—paying attention to the decree of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet of 7 February 1990 "On Soviet- German Agreements of 1939 and Elimination of the Consequences for Lithuania,"

—verifying the illegality of the invalidation of the Constitution of Lithuania of 12 May 1938 during the course of the aggression against the independent Lithuanian state and its annexation by the Soviet Union of 15 June 1940,

—achieving the restoration of the violated sovereign rights of the people and the Lithuanian state, hereby decrees:

1. To invalidate the Constitution (Basic Law) of the Lithuanian SSR of 20 April 1978.

2. To invalidate the Constitution (Basic Law) of the USSR of 7 October 1977 and also the Fundamentals of Legislation of the USSR and Union Republics and other USSR laws on the territory of the Lithuanian Republic.

3. To reinstate the Constitution of Lithuania of 12 May 1938 throughout the entire territory of the Lithuanian Republic while invalidating the sections and articles that regulate the status of the president, the sejm, the state council, and the state control of the republic.

4. To establish that the reinstatement of the Constitution of Lithuania of 12 May 1938 in and of itself restores the validity of the laws in effect in the Lithuanian Republic before 15 June 1940.

5. The present law goes into force from the moment of its adoption.
[Signed] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic, V. LANDSBERGIS.
[Signed] Secretary of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic, L. SABUTIS. Vilnius, 11 March 1990.

Lithuanian Deputy Chairman Views Independence

90UN1342I Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 14 Mar 90 p 2

[Report on speech by Cheslovas Stankyavichyus, Lithuanian Supreme Soviet deputy chairman: "On the Restoration of the Lithuanian State, Reinstatement of the Lithuanian Constitution of 1938, and the Temporary Basic Law of the Lithuanian Republic"]

[Text] Esteemed deputies, esteemed guests. Drafts of three documents of extreme importance have been handed out to you. The first document is the decree of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic, "On the Restoration of the Lithuanian State," the second is the law of the Lithuanian Republic, "On Reinstatement of the Constitution of Lithuania of 12 May 1938." The third document is the law of the Lithuanian Republic on the temporary basic law of the Lithuania Republic. (The speaker read the drafts of the documents.)

The speaker went on to say that he wanted to comment more extensively and, emphasizing certain basic points, make the audience familiar with the appendix to the law which is a draft of the temporary basic law of the Lithuanian Republic. These legislative acts were prepared by the initiative work group of the club of deputies from Sajudis which worked in keeping with the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] which grants the deputies the right to legislative initiative. The draft of the temporary law that has been presented should not be considered a draft of the constitution of the future democratic Lithuanian state. This is rather a basic reinforcement of the socio-legal and sociopolitical possibilities and democratic procedure.

During the preparation of these decisions, which mean a significant about-face in the life of the Lithuanian state and designate the landmarks and goals of its future, it was necessary to solve a constitutional problem which encompasses the totality of all the acts. As you could note from the text of the law, with the proclamation of the decree concerning the restoration of the Lithuanian state, naturally, the Constitution of the Lithuanian Republic of 12 May 1938 goes into effect or, more precisely, begins to operate. On the other hand, all the legislation in effect up to this point was coordinated with the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR and the Constitution of the USSR with an extremely limited degree of sovereignty for the Lithuanian state as a part of the USSR, which is a unitary state. Therefore the group of legislative proposals had to solve the problem of how to coordinate this situation with the act concerning the restoration of the Lithuanian state. The work group was not given the task of creating a constitutional law—beginning with legislative proposals and the development of articles. We have taken advantage of many articles of the current Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR and have done what was envisioned in the Sajudis legislative program. Namely, we eliminated all obligations to the USSR, its Constitution, and its laws. The draft of the new Lithuanian SSR Constitution has been discussed since last year. The work was ending since the improved and prepared draft could be accepted in the work group that was set up and operating under the Presidium of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet. We also made use of the wordings of many of its articles.

Our goal was to coordinate these constitutional norms with the restored Constitution of the Lithuanian Republic, the basis of which was the Constitution of 1922. Of course it would have been best of all if by this time we had prepared the draft of the new Constitution of the Lithuanian Republic which is being developed by a group of highly qualified and worthy legal experts. But the work is not yet complete. On the other hand, this constitution could not have been adopted yet since our legal system is also in need of a certain amount of evolution and development so that it will correspond to the fundamental legal norms of a truly democratic Lithuanian Republic.

In addition to the temporary Basic Law of the Lithuanian Republic, references to sources have been handed out to the deputies. These can be used to become oriented as to the articles and where they were borrowed from. I wish to emphasize that entire sections have been taken from the Constitution of the Lithuania SSR and there is no need to change them. These are sections pertaining to the electoral system, the regulation of the deputy status, and other things. Editorial corrections have been made to certain of them. For example, the old name of the state has been crossed out and the new one written in. Or references to the idea that citizens of the Lithuanian SSR must observe the laws of the USSR have been eliminated. These are insignificant corrections and it seemed to me that they could be transferred to the draft of the temporary Basic Law without long discussions.

We could not get by without creating new sections since deep economic reforms are taking place in the Lithuanian Republic and therefore it was necessary to change the section on the formation of the government and the regulation of its activity, taking into account the law on

government that is being prepared. Specialists also prepared constitutional articles that encompass questions of regulating the budget of the Lithuanian Republic.

Not having the opportunity to comment in greater detail on all the articles and being disappointed about the fact that the deputies did not have the opportunity to become familiar with the draft in greater depth, I wish to emphasize once again that the majority of the constitutional provisions have been left unchanged, that is, they are the ones that have been used up to this point to regulate issues of our public, social, and political life. I shall note only certain of the most significant changes that are more oriented toward the Constitution of the Lithuanian Republic. The structure of the temporary Basic Law has been changed somewhat. The chapters are arranged differently. There is a different wording of the first article of the Constitution which proclaims that the Lithuanian Republic is a sovereign democratic state which expresses the common will and interests of the Lithuanian people. It says in the second article that the sovereign state power belongs to the people of Lithuania and it stipulates how this power is expressed. The section is augmented with what we consider to be an important democratic point which goes like this: "Nobody has the right to limit this power or to appropriate it." Usurpation of the people's power or any restriction of it would be an anticonstitutional act. In terms of meaning and content this constitutional norm is analogous to the norm in the Constitution of the Republic of France. The fourth article in the new edition goes like this: "The territory of the Lithuanian Republic is whole and indivisible and its boundaries can be changed only on the basis of an international agreement after its ratification by the people's council of Lithuania with four-fifths of the votes of all the deputies."

If we accept the act concerning the restoration of the Lithuanian state we shall also have to immediately solve the problem of creating a system for guarding the territory. Therefore Article 8 of the Constitution reads: "Guarding the territory is regulated by law." This means that we intend to create a system for guarding the territory. Article 9 shows that it is an accomplished fact that the seal of the Lithuanian Republic is a blue warrior on a red field.

Let me note an extremely important point that pertains to the life of the nation and the society. Article 15, in the place where it talks about the family and aid to the family, reflects a new attitude toward the family on the part of the state, if you approve it: "Maternity and the family are under the special care of the state." This is a constitutional norm which has been reinforced in the Constitution of the Lithuanian Republic. It is proposed that we make an addition to this article, the meaning and content of which are taken from the Sajudis election platform. "The labor of mothers who are rearing two or more children at home is regarded as activity that is important to society and is reimbursed according to the procedure established by law."

All these documents as a unified package with constitutional effect should be discussed together and adopted after all the laws are discussed. Taking into account the references to sources that have been given here, I suggest today that we do not make proposals pertaining to the articles that have been in effect up to this point that have been tested in juridical practice and life. We could decide that the temporary Basic Law could be adopted at the present time with only the most necessary corrections and would go into effect. Possibly after a certain amount of time, even in the present session, the Basic Law that is adopted will be improved and changed, for this is our right.

The speaker answered questions from the deputies.

Debates on this issue follow.

Lithuanian Communist Party Appeals for Unity

90UN1293F Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 16 Mar 90 p 3

[ELTA report: "An Appeal for Accord"]

[Text] A conference was held on 14 January at the Communist Party of Lithuania Central Committee in which a group of Central Committee members, secretaries of the city and rayon party committees, and representatives of primary organizations took part.

The views of a majority of participants in the conference are reflected in the adopted Appeal to the People of Lithuania which states:

"An act restoring Lithuania's independence has been proclaimed. The first step has been taken on a difficult road toward true statehood and genuine self-expression for Lithuania. The ambitions of political parties and movements and their individual leaders should not interfere with this step.

"We believe that in creating a democratic Lithuanian state we should recognize only democratic constitutional norms, in keeping with which the candidates supported by Sajudis have won a lawful victory in the election struggle.

"This majority has likewise proposed the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic, who has been elected.

"Now that the decision has been made and the leadership of the Supreme Soviet has been elected, we have a duty to place our confidence in it in the name of the independence of Lithuania.

"We appeal to you, esteemed citizens of Lithuania who sincerely supported Algirdas Brazauskas, and we thank you. We acknowledge the right of the citizens of Lithuania to express their attitude toward particular

issues in the political life of our republic in a constitutional manner. However, the further collection of signatures could affect the declaration of Lithuania's independence.

"We also state that the rally in Vilnius organized on Sunday by Yedinstvo and other organizations may damage the approval of the residents of Lithuania."

The full text of the appeal is published in the newspaper TIESA.

Moscow Public Reacts to Lithuanian Situation

LD0404060990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2027 GMT 3 Apr 90

[Excerpts] What comments are being made on the streets of Moscow about the decision of the Lithuanian parliament to leave the union? Our opinion poll follows. [video shows street interviews]

[Unidentified elderly man] I took part in the liberation of Lithuania. I know about Lithuania. There are many Russians and others living there. Therefore, I have a negative attitude to this. [passage omitted]

[(Gastrov)] I have just come back from Vilnius and I liked it a lot. I was breathing completely different air which is different from Moscow air. I am (Oleg Mironovich Gastrov) and I live in Moscow.

[Correspondent] So you support them?

[(Gastrov)] Absolutely, 100 percent.

[Unidentified man] I totally support them. [words indistinct], only they should not be in such a rush.

[Second unidentified man] On the whole, I can welcome this. But I do not at all like the form of leaving.

[Third unidentified man] I am glad that they have left.

[Correspondent] They have not left yet.

[Third unidentified man] Let them; [Words indistinct].

[Fourth unidentified man] I support the position of the president. This is not the time now. They should give proper thought and weigh up all the pros and cons.

No 'Immediate' Troop Transfers to Lithuania

LD0404213990 Moscow International Service in Polish 1400 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] The mass media are closely watching the activities of Soviet troops in Lithuania. Facts are often distorted, says Lieutenant General Pyotr (Chaus), chief of staff of the Baltic Military District. Our correspondent has interviewed him about the attitude toward Lithuanian soldiers who have left their units. Only 35 have been detained; there have been no mass arrests. (Chaus) expects many Lithuanian soldiers to return to their units soon; all who come back voluntarily will be given the necessary documents.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] What military operation is the staff of the Baltic Military District planning in Lithuania? Is it planning to occupy buildings and arrest people?

[(Chaus)] We are not drawing up this kind of plan. The district's troops are carrying out the tasks entrusted to them by the minister of defense; they are carrying out their military duty and undergoing battle and political training. Rumors of an alleged concentration of troops, their transfer to Lithuania, and the creation of stormtroop units are unfounded. The General Staff has informed us that not a single new unit will make its appearance in the republic in the immediate future; none will be withdrawn either for the time being. [end recording]

Abalkin Views Baltic-Moscow Ownership Problems

WA1903192390 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 20 Feb 90 p 3

[Interview with L. Abalkin, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by S. Prokoshenko, LATINFORM parliamentary correspondent: "Ownership and Sovereignty"]

[Text] [Prokoshenko] From what I have heard, there are great difficulties in the implementation of the Law on Economic Independence of the Baltic Republics...

[Abalkin] Those difficulties have ended. On 7 February of this year a resolution on urgent measures for the implementation of the Law on Economic Independence of the Three Baltic Republics was signed by the four chairmen of the Councils of Ministers—Comrades Ryzhkov, Toome, Sakalauskas, and Bresis. We decided that today, while there are still no laws on property, land, or taxation, we would not try to solve everything right now and for the next thousand years, but rather separate out immediate measures that can be implemented this year. We also defined a range of enterprises which were turned over to the authority of the republics.

[Prokoshenko] Please name those problems with ownership that you consider "sore points" in relations between the Baltic republics and the center.

[Abalkin] First I would like to make the reservation that the Law on Economic Independence of the Baltic Republics functions within the framework of a federated structure of the USSR. The secession of any of the republics from the Union puts a halt to the activities of this law and cancels the aforementioned resolution, including turning the enterprises over to the Union republics. This must be perfectly clear.

One of the most difficult problems concerns the concept of "authority." The law stipulates that the enterprises will be turned over **to the authority** of the republic. This

is not ownership, and it is not subordination. Latvia, for instance, has not expressed the intention of establishing administrative control of the republic over these enterprises and of commanding them as the central authorities commanded them in the past. Turning over **to their authority** means that the activities of the enterprises are regulated by the laws of the given republic. Accordingly, the republic can implement measures with regard to changing the profile of production, the specialization of the enterprises, or the trend of their activities. But on the whole this applies to enterprises that are oriented toward the internal market of the republic.

The second "sore point" is, of course, ownership of land. The land belongs to the people living in a given territory. This right of ownership gives the republic the exclusive right to agree with the construction of this or that project or to forbid it. But the sovereignty and integrity of the union republic must not exclude the sovereignty and integrity of the Union as a country. Here we can come to a solution only by coming to agreement on two elements—on the integrity of the Union as a federation and on the sovereignty of each of its formations. The solution takes this reality into account.

Gorbachev Warns Ryuytel Against Independence

LD0404211390 Tallinn International Service in Swedish 2000 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] As we know, the Estonian Supreme Soviet declared the latest decision of the [word indistinct] Supreme Soviet concerning Estonian territory as illegal. Thus it was (?stated on Friday) that the period of the restoration of the [word indistinct] of the republic, that is the restoration of Estonia, has begun.

This morning Arnold Ryuytel, chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet, informed Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev about the decision by the Estonian Supreme Soviet. He said later to (?the whole) Supreme Soviet in Tallinn that there had been a discussion on these questions with Gorbachev. Ryuytel pointed out in the conversation with Gorbachev that the law on the secession of the republics from the USSR had been adopted yesterday.

During the (?morning) session, Ryuytel announced that he had held a telephone conversation with Gorbachev during which he informed him of the Estonian Supreme Soviet's decision to restore Estonia's independence and of the decision to start a transition to independence in Estonia. According to Ryuytel, Gorbachev said that if Estonia does not withdraw its decisions concerning independence, he and the whole USSR will take similar measures to those already taken against Lithuania.

In this connection, the members of the Estonian Supreme Soviet decided to send a (?message) to Gorbachev protesting his decision and his statement.

New Estonian Prime Minister Interviewed

LD0404223490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by H. Lenk in Tallinn, identified by screen caption]

[Text] Here is a report from the Baltic area. Our correspondent in Tallinn sent us this today. The session of the Estonian Supreme Soviet is continuing its work there.

[Begin recording] [Lenk] Today was the fifth working day of the new Estonian parliament. During that time, quite a few decisions and documents of importance to the republic were adopted, including the decision on the status of the republic, where a historical appraisal of the formation of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic is given, as well as a statement on the restoration of the independence of the Lithuanian Republic. Today the deputies adopted the decision on the abolition of the People's Control Committee. [video shows parliamentary scenes]

The chairmen of various commissions, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the head of the government were elected at the session. As has already been announced, Edgar Savisaar, a member of the People's Front and one of the authors of the (IME) program for a financially autonomous Estonia, was elected head of the government. [video shows various parliamentarians, then Lenk is seen speaking to Savisaar]

[Lenk] Will the policy of a financially autonomous Estonia be continued?

[Savisaar] Yes, of course. Through the (IME) program, on the one hand, we want to bring about economic independence, and, on the other, it is a transition to a market economy. So far, we have not achieved either, so there are no reasons for giving up that policy. On the contrary, we will try to follow it more intensively.

[Lenk] One more question: Tell us, are you a member of the CPSU?

[Savisaar] No. [end recording]

Estonia's Ryuytel on Independence Moves

LD0504135390

[Editorial Report] Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian at 1100 GMT on 5 April carries the live 45-minute "Peak Hour" program in which studio presenters Raul Malk and Juri Hansen introduces their guests: Arnold Ryuytel, chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet, and Arno Alman, secretary of the Estonian Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Ryuytel says that there is a profound difference between the previous and present presidiums. All the members of the present presidium are new to the work. The second presidium meeting has just taken place this morning, with a lot of time spent on discussing the mechanism for

creating new laws. The agenda of the next Supreme Soviet session was discussed: There will be three draft laws under discussion, one on army service, one on the procedure for temporary administration of Estonia, and the third on national symbols. Also, poor attendance at the sessions was informally discussed and Ryuytel thinks that measures may be found to ensure better attendances.

On the subject of the army-service law, Ryuytel says that careful thought has to go into it because a whole string of laws will be repealed, yet there must not be any vacuum and it must be foreseen that the new laws will work. On Saturday, Kochetov, first deputy USSR minister of defense, will arrive in Estonia for a visit and discussions. Ryuytel says that on Monday the Presidium will inform the Supreme Soviet of those discussions. The draft law is due for its second reading on Monday.

Ryuytel says that today's presidium meeting also discussed an address to Gorbachev, in answer to Gorbachev's 4 April phone call. "We adopted the view that we will present an explanation in respect of the resolution which was adopted by us last Friday. We will also deal with this on Monday, again at the presidium meeting, and we will discuss it through with the Supreme Soviet deputies."

On Monday the endorsing of members of government will start. The procedure for this will be that the prime minister will present his choices to the presidium who will look at the nominations, pass them on to a standing commission which will make its own suggestions and hand the nominations back to the presidium which will then present them to the Supreme Soviet.

A listener asks about the Ryuytel-Gorbachev telephone conversation yesterday. Ryuytel says that first Gorbachev telephoned him, did not find him present and then Ryuytel telephoned Gorbachev back. A radio listener asks if this address to Gorbachev will also be made known within the republic. Ryuytel says that that will definitely be so. Once he has informed the world of Gorbachev's telephone call the public at large will also be kept informed of what follows. Ryuytel adds: "Well, the first proposal on the part of Mikhail Gorbachev was indeed that I should inform the USSR Supreme Soviet but I then said that we will discuss these replies within the presidium of our own Supreme Soviet and in our Supreme Soviet—these positions, so that they will indeed be collegial and not by personal positions."

Ryuytel describes the situation in Estonia and how it has been gradually developing. "And perhaps the most decisive stage for us was to adopt on 2 February the declaration on independence, in the form in which it has been formulated, while the declaration itself, in a way, follows history like a chronicle of events, and sets an aim in front of society, of our Estonian society. On 26 February we formulated a first step within this aim, in the way of a resolution, and now, last Friday, we saw the next step. So I would say once again—I would emphasize the same principle—that our path of this kind toward democratization of Estonian society, in order to arrive at the independent republic of Estonia, has been thought out and persistent, and one needs to proceed forward along this path. In the given case, one of the steps along it is also the provision of an explanation and justification for our steps which will indeed be declarative and not directly lawful but will constitute in itself a serious political step which we wish to present to Mikhail Gorbachev, the USSR president."

The telephone conversation with Gorbachev is referred to later when Ryuytel, talking about other difficulties says: "I very much still count on the fact that in the near future—as discussed with Mikhail Gorbachev on the telephone—we will still open talks. And then we could settle, I believe, quite a number of questions. Of course, not immediately."

Ryuytel also talks about his personal belief in cooperation and mentions several movements whose good ideas he feels and has been feeling sympathy for, including the ERSP [Estonian National Independence Party]. He is also often in touch with Tunne Kelam, chairman of the Estonian Committee, and envisages close cooperation between the Supreme Soviet and the Estonian Committee. Almann also says that close cooperation is crucial at present, in the transitional period, when priorities simply cannot be reviewed: It is immaterial, in view of the common aim, whose views are most important or most precise. He feels that presidium representatives could regularly be invited to sessions of the Estonian Committee, officially, as a matter of course.

A listener asks if the public will be informed of discussions as they occur when the USSR first deputy defense minister arrives on Saturday. Ryuytel promises that that will indeed be so.

Gorbachev Opposes Estonian Declaration

AU0404172890 Paris AFP in English 1704 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, April 4 (AFP)—President Mikhail Gorbachev telephoned the Estonian leader Arnold Ryuytel late Tuesday to express his opposition to Friday's decision by the Estonian parliament declaring Soviet occupation of the Baltic republic illegal, an official source in Tallinn said Wednesday.

Rein Weidemann, a leader of the Estonian Popular Front, said the Soviet head of state had threatened "measures like those taken regarding Lithuania."

Mr. Ryuytel reported the conversation he had with Mr. Gorbachev in an address Wednesday to Estonian deputies, said Mr. Weidmann, who has just been elected chairman of the Estonian parliament's press committee.

Estonian Plenum Discusses Party Relations

LD2803201790 Moscow TASS in English 1950 GMT 28 Mar 90

[By TASS Correspondent Aleksandr Kharchenko]

[Text] Tallinn March 28 TASS—The Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party advocating unity with the Soviet Communist Party held its first plenary meeting here today.

It examined questions of relations with the Central Committee of the independent Estonian Communist Party. The plenum heard information by Central Committee representatives about their meetings with communists from industrial enterprises and organisations in Tallinn and Sillamae.

"All difficult questions, including property issues, will be settled only at joint sittings of Central Committees plenums as well as meetings of bureaus and secretariats," V. Yermolayev, member of the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party advocating unity with the CPSU, told TASS.

"Relations will be built on respect for the position of opponents," he added.

According to the plenary meeting, the main task today is to find out the opinion of Estonian communists about the situation in the Estonian Communist Party in order to tackle the current tasks.

Military Commissar Protests Labor Service Law

LD2903034990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0130 GMT 29 Mar 90

[Text] Major General (Raynpyder), military commissar of Estonia, has sent a protest to the republic's Supreme Soviet over the passing of a law on labor service in the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. He believes that the law would not have appeared in such a form in a rule-of-law state. USSR people's deputies representing Estonia have not tabled the issue of an alternative service for debate in the country's supreme legislative body, although it is a pressing issue that needs to be tackled. In the republic, it has been resolved hastily and has been adopted in a crude form. The law states that labor service is not subordinate to the USSR Armed Forces. It consists of compulsory work at enterprises, establishments, and organizations of the Estonian SSR in line with the procedure and time periods stipulated by the law. Length of labor service is 30 months, or 12 months for citizens who have graduated from a higher educational institution but who have not undergone a military training cycle.

The Estonian Supreme Soviet's endeavors to give young men the right of choice is understandable. The law therefore states that labor service is an alternative to military service and is obligatory for citizens between the ages of 18 and 27 who are reside permanently in the Estonian SSR and are on the military register, but unable to serve in the Armd Forces for weighty reasons.

Alternative service exists in a number of countries, such as the FRG. There the law on alternative service passed in 1960 regulates the legal foundations for refusal to serve in the Armed Forces, and explains the rights and obligations of young people who do not wish to serve in the Bundeswehr for religious, philosophical, ethical, and other reasons. However, since the law of the Estonian SSR does not clearly formulate the criteria by which these weighty reasons are to be defined, different interpretations of the law are possible, and there will be conscripts suitable for service in the ranks who will attempt to exploit it, the Estonian military commissar said. He stressed that the law needs to be made more precise.

Tallinn Militia Sets Up Own Trade Union

PM0903122590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by IZVESTIYA correspondent L. Levitskiy: "Militiamen's Trade Union"]

[Text] Tallinn—Staffers of the Tallinn Internal Affairs Administration have set up their own trade union—the first association of this kind in the country. True, the idea has not originated locally. It is also being discussed in other cities. However, life has induced the people in Tallinn to embark on its implementation before anyone else. IZVESTIYA reported on the conflict between the Tallinn City Soviet and Internal Affairs Administration staffers in the feature "Who Will Protect the Militia?"

Staffers, both officers and rank-and-file members, have decided to rely only on themselves, on their unity. Statutes and laws, while entrusting them with dangerous tasks and urging them to selflessly discharge their official duty, are highly restrictive when it comes to their civic liberties and professional rights, usually claiming that this is done in the interests of the public. Yet these interests are frequently interpreted subjectively on the basis of prevailing circumstances and preferences. According to the Tallinn militia, its independent trade union will be able to counter this.

Its task is to create conditions for the most effective discharge of service; ensure the protection of the professional, political, and civic rights and dignity of the members of the union and their families; and establish close ties between the internal affairs organs leadership, the local authorities, and the public.

At their congress, Tallinn militiamen approved the trade union's statutes, adopted a resolution, and elected a provisional committee. The establishment of primary trade union organizations has begun in all subdivisions of the internal affairs administration.

Estonian 20th Communist Party Congress Described

PM0304144590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
31 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report from Tallinn by I. Teterin and V. Shirokov: "Three Days in March: Chronicle of Estonian Communist Party 20th Congress With Digressions and Comments by Our Special Correspondents"]

[Text] **Day One. 23 March 1990**

The Estonian Communist Party 20th Congress had a hard time getting started. Even the simplest procedural questions, such as the ratification of the agenda and the formation of working organs, became bogged down in endless wrangling and consultations. The situation was like the standoff in a track cycle event when the competitors barely move, waiting for the moment to make the decisive sprint.

It was clear that this was the first test of strength. Essentially the Estonian Communist Party now has two wings setting different strategic goals. For some the main thing is to prove that the Estonian Communist Party can retain its influence among the indigenous population if it becomes autonomous and begins to struggle to secure the republic's state independence. Others are convinced that the Estonian Communist Party should preserve its organizational unity with the CPSU and advocate improving the Soviet Federation on the basis of a new Union treaty.

The first procedural votes showed that the disposition of forces was unequal. There was a rough ratio of 400 votes to 230. The rest wavered. Alas, that is the reality of the current state of the Estonian Communist Party. The party is disunited and its will is paralyzed. What about the prospects?

Elections to the republic Supreme Soviet were held 18 March. More than half the deputies are communists. Although it is true that many of them ran in the name of all manner of organizations or movements except the Communist Party. And for that reason the Estonian Communist Party's possibility of influencing the formation of the supreme organs of power is not so considerable. The present congress was the last chance to consolidate in the expression of a single political will.

There are, of course, centrists in the Central Committee. But, unfortunately, this line has not yet found enough supporters. V. Valjas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, appears to us to be its representative. He is a man with a lot of political experience, a professional diplomat, and someone versed in the subtle art of compromise, thanks to which many very acute problems have been smoothed out in in the republic in the last 18 months. However, by no means everyone appreciates this skill. Among Russian speakers, for example, Valjas is often accused of ideological apostasy. The Estonian newspapers print biting caricatures of him, while national fundamentalists from extreme movements even accuse the Estonian Communist leader of betraying the interests of the people...

Valjas' report to the 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress described the situation in the republic as one of crisis. It promised no easy solutions. It made clear that there are three major postulates which must be taken account of in policymaking. First, Estonia is the age-old home of the Estonians. Second, Estonia has neighbors, whose interests must be respected. And, finally, there are hundreds of thousands of people of nonindigenous nationality living in Estonia for whom this land has long since become their native home.

Virtually all political parties and social movements in the republic today are discussing ways of achieving state autonomy. The Estonian Communist Party cannot ignore these demands. But it must also be realized that this is a long path. And it is only on the basis of the principles of the consideration of different interests and mutual respect that real guarantees of both the republic's sovereignty and the existence of its non-Estonian community are possible.

It is not proving possible to secure an atmosphere of stability as yet. But people need civil peace. Instead of this an acute struggle is being waged between diametrically opposed political forces. Nevertheless, the Communist Party has been and should remain the consolidating principle of society. As of today it is the sole political party in Estonia in which Estonians and representatives of other nationalities form roughly equal numbers. However, given the emergence of the multiparty system, the Estonian Communist Party will be condemned to play an outsider's role unless it becomes a cohesive political force.

At the end of his report V. Valjas said: "Self-purification rather than transformation into another party is the way for the Estonian Communist Party to renew itself."

Scarcely was the political report over before speakers were falling over one another to get to the rostrum. Their trenchant, well honed arguments were, judging by appearances, prepared in advance. In the heat of emotion they did not always choose their words carefully. Here are just a few of the tirades.

A. Zybin, deputy secretary of the "RET" association party committee: "The party has split into two camps. The main culprit here is the Central Committee first secretary. He failed to explain to people that the creation of a uninational state is an dominant idea."

H. Kaur, first secretary of the Raplaskiy Estonian Communist Party Raykom [rayon committee]: "The communists of our rayon do not believe in the slogan of a new federation. People are leaving the party because it is linked with the CPSU."

S. Sovetnikov, director of Narvaskiy Polytechnic: "We maintain a coy silence about the fact that the Estonian Communist Party should be communist. Our task is to ensure that renegades from the party do not unite under the Estonian Communist Party banner."

However, there was also the discovery of people whose style of thinking was capable of impressing both sides. For example, the speech by L. Pasternak, deputy chief engineer at the Tallinn Bakery Products Combine. He spoke about the political ignorance and economic illiteracy prevailing in society and the political intrigue based on incompetence and naive harebrained schemes. And the surprising thing is that he was not classified as a reactionary even after the following assertion: "Throughout the civilized world you find that it is forces which are to a large extent conservative and prudent rather than radicals or extremists which are stably in power. They provide these countries with a steady increase in the standard of living, education, and freedoms, giving absolute priority to common human values and human rights."

Day Two. 24 March 1990

The debate continued. Some delegates sought an analogy between the situation in Estonia and Lithuania. True, it appears that as yet Estonia is not intending to slam the door on the USSR. Even Estonian radicals assert: Talks first, then political decisions.

When the "republicans" in the Estonian Communist Party speak about the party achieving autonomy they also have no intention, as it were, of breaking ties with the CPSU. The election of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress was one of the items on the agenda.

The fierceness of the dispute that developed at the congress was certainly not just bound up with different standpoints regarding the essence of state and party building in Estonia. In fact a struggle was under way between different ideological precepts. We speak about this because the ideological convictions of some congress delegates can be described as communist only with difficulty. For example, during a recess we conversed with Academician V. Palm, who is, incidentally, a USSR people's deputy. He set about trying to prove that Marxism is a pseudo-science. He accused the teaching's founder of vulgarization and of an eclectic attempt to unite philosophy and science. One wonders, it is true, why a venerable academician for whom communist ideology is simply "risible and naive" remains a member of a party which bears that very name. Moreover, he is zealously campaigning for the Estonian Communist Party to become absolutely autonomous.

It seems that for some people the existing structures of the Estonian Communist Party are merely a mechanism for the exercise of their personal political ambitions...

Delegate H. Barabaner aptly used the descriptive phrase "gutter politics" in the hall. In his view, this is dangerous because policy is based on slogans and simple solutions and geared to appeal to the crowd. And the crowd, as people know, produces fuehrers, not leaders. The speaker stated: "We should not seek to win trust through flashy slogans. We need specific social programs."

Unfortunately, the Communist Party has few such integrated programs today. Even the idea of the republic gaining economic autonomy on the basis of territorial economic accountability is recalled less and less often. On the other hand, the "Moscow functionaries" are increasingly often accused of conservatism.

The main topic toward which the discussion turned was the problem of the choice of the party's future. V. Yermolayev, secretary of the "Estrybprom" Association party committee, put it thus: "Two questions remain fundamental—are we for an autonomous party or for unity with the CPSU, are we for withdrawal from the USSR or in favor of searching for our own place in a new Soviet Federation?"

Meanwhile, the program for the reorganization of the Estonian Communist Party says unequivocally that only when it is autonomous will it be able to effectively participate in Estonia's political life, flexibly alter its tactics, create a coalition, and compete with other parties and movements. The Estonian Communist Party should re-form itself on the basis of a voluntary decision by present-day CPSU members to join it. The party is setting about extricating the republic from the crisis. Fundamentally new production, distribution, and social relations will be introduced for this. Property inequality and even unemployment are also expected. But the republic's main economic resource is its geopolitical position, that is, its role as a kind of bridge between East and West.

The party will struggle to restore the autonomy of the Estonian state, but only on the basis of the free expression of the people's will and in the light of the processes taking place in the USSR and Europe. The republic's state system will become parliamentary and multiparty.

Communists of nonindigenous nationality proposed a number of amendments to the program: It should reflect the Estonian Communist Party's attitude to the possibility of concluding a new Union treaty with the USSR, clearly formulate the nature of relations with the USSR, define the place of the socialist basis of the republic's life, and so forth.

The amendments were rejected by the drafting commission. Then V. Kovtun, secretary of the Estonian Steamship Company party committee, made a statement on behalf of a number of major party organizations that if the program was adopted unchanged, it would effectively mean the creation of a new party. After which he urged delegates not to vote for this program.

The congress presidium proposed that a compromise be sought and that the session recommence the following day.

Day Three. 25 March 1990

A. Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took the floor:

"I am convinced that we are all working on solutions which will provide a future for the communist movement in Estonia. We are entering a very important stage in the congress—the adoption of program documents. There are a number of provisions there which could appear contentious and unacceptable to a number of delegates. But I think that the program has opened a door which enables us to leave the congress as a single detachment. The 28th CPSU Congress lies ahead, and we must find solutions there which will make it possible for the republic communist parties to work autonomously without losing their links with the CPSU..."

The program document's fate was decided by secret ballot. The result was 421 for, 232 against. The correlation of forces among "republicans" and "federalists" had not changed, as we can see. A well considered, sage decision was required at that juncture to prevent a split. After a meeting of delegates it was seemingly found. It was decided to form an Estonian Communist Party Central Committee on a coalition basis for a six-month transitional period, with each faction having two Central Committee secretaries in the Secretariat.

For the Estonian Communist Party the question of the masses' trust in the leadership is the most important one today. That may be why the proposal was made to establish the post of a party chairman who will be a member of neither the Central Committee nor the Bureau. He is accountable to the congress alone, and in his practical work will be concerned with links with other parties in Estonia and outside communist parties.

V. Valjas was nominated for the post of party chairman. He said that he had been intending to retire but that if the delegates entrusted this post to him he could accept it on one condition, namely, that he would not receive a salary for his work out of the party budget. V. Valjas was elected chairman of the Estonian Communist Party virtually unanimously.

A secret ballot then took place to elect some of the delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress—the remainder will be elected by party districts. The names of candidates from which the coalition Central Committee of the transitional period was to be formed were put on separate ballot papers.

Before the declaration of the results, delegates were unexpectedly summoned to the hall. M. Titma, secretary (now ex-secretary) of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, who was in the chair, reported that two more documents had to be adopted—the first informed the inhabitants of Estonia that an autonomous Estonian Communist Party had been set up in Tallinn 25 March. Its statute would be established in 10 days. Many people in the hall simply did not expect this development. The "federalists" also refused to vote for a statement and telegrams to Moscow and union republics concerning Lithuanian questions.

The balance that had been established with such difficulty was thus upset. Moreover, according to the results of the Central Committee elections, the most active figures from the "federalist" wing of the party—A. Gusev, P. Panfilov, L. Annus, and V. Kovtun—lost because of the "republican" majority.

A statement by the Russian-speaking minority of delegates was then announced, which said that they had done their utmost to prevent a split. But the other side had effectively brought the congress to the creation of a new party. It would be undemocratic to restrain anyone from joining it. But for CPSU members the document is invalid. This section of communists therefore decided to continue the congress and elect a Central Committee on their own.

There remained 123 delegates in the hall after the closure of the congress. Delegates from Narva and Sillamae—major industrial centers with a predominantly Russian-speaking population—went home to consult with communists before making a final decision.

It was resolved to elect 35 communists—19 of them directly at the congress, the rest to be coopted later—to the "parallel" Central Committee.

A. Gusev and P. Panfilov were elected Central Committee secretaries. This took place during the night of 25-26 March.

Thus we have a unique situation. Two Central Committees will operate under the "roof" of one party with a single name. Two delegations will attend the 28th CPSU Congress.

In short, the situation in the Estonian Communist Party is not going to become easier by any means. But perhaps a solution will be found in time. It is important that communists, whether divided into two factions or two parties, be able to maintain a spirit of restraint and civilized behavior and seek to find new compromises. Whether this is successful or not only time will tell...

Supreme Soviet Agenda Aimed at Separation

PM3003153790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 90 p 1

[Report by own correspondent G. Sapozhnikova: "Who Is For and Who Against?]

[Text] The newly elected Estonian Supreme Soviet started work in Tallinn yesterday.

According to the forecasts of politicians who claim that Estonia has chosen its own prudent, well-considered route—as distinct from Lithuania—no "surprises" at all were foreseen at the session of the republic Supreme Soviet's 12th Convocation.

But there was a surprise. Or more accurately, a whole package of surprises specially prepared for the session by the Estonian People's Front. "Lithuania expects us to act more quickly," Deputy Enn Poldroos explained in proposing the following additions to the session agenda: the

Declaration on the State Status of Estonia, the Law on the Interim Procedure for the Government of Estonia, the Law on the Emblems of Estonia, the Appeal of the Estonian Supreme Soviet to the President of the USSR and to the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania, and the Declaration of the Supreme Soviet of Estonia on Cooperation between the Supreme Soviet and the Estonian Congress.

The point of the documents needs no elucidation—the Estonian Supreme Soviet declares itself separated from the system of USSR state power, declares a transitional period, and puts into operation an interim procedure for government on Estonian territory.

The Estonian deputies chorused "aye," the non-Estonian ones "nay." All these items were included on the session agenda. The results of voting on them, given the current distribution of forces in the Estonian Supreme Soviet, were wholly predictable. While the proposals of the Russian-speaking group of deputies on including on the agenda the Law on Citizenship and the Referendum (which would seem to usher in independence) were not adopted.

The uncontested election of the chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet was a surprise. The People's Front, on the grounds that Maryu Lauristin declined to stand for this post, supported the candidacy of Arnold Ryuytel.

The session continues.

'Unusual' Troop Movements Reported Near Tallinn

PM0304114490 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 2 Apr 90 p 6

[Flemming Rose dispatch: "Troop Maneuvers in Estonia"]

[Text] Tallinn—In the last two days there have been unusual troop movements just outside Tallinn.

According to Estonian sources, an unknown number of troop reinforcements have arrived at two large Soviet military bases in Estonia. One of the bases is no more than a couple of kilometers from the capital, while the other is in Tapa, 90 km from Tallinn.

Klara Hallik, who is an Estonian deputy on the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, compares the military operations with those that have taken place in Lithuania in the last two weeks.

"When we ask the military for an explanation, they are only prepared to say that they are normal exercises.

"But it is no accident that the 'exercises' are taking place immediately after the Estonian parliament took its first steps along the road to independence," Hallik said.

Latvian Deputy Remarks on 'Lithuania's Example'

LD3103192990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1125 GMT 31 Mar 90

[Text] Riga, 31 March. TASS correspondent Galina Kuchkina reports:

LAUKU AVIZE (RURAL NEWSPAPER), one of the most popular publications in Latvia, has told about a meeting in the editorial office with Yanis Vagris, first secretary of the Communist Party of that Baltic republic. Touching upon events in Lithuania, he said: "'Sajudis' proclaimed that it wished to attain the goal of state independence by parliamentary means. But do the events confirm that? A parliamentary path is not a one-way street, rather it is a path of dialogue and discussions. I could hear so far only a monologue by "Sajudis". The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet is adopting one decision after another but they are generated in a one-sided way, without serious consultations with the country's center or its president".

In Vagris' view, such an option can hardly be described as the most effective and acceptable, including for Latvia, too. If its parliament follows Lithuania's example, then, Vagris noted, the situation here will acquire a more acute nature because social and national divisions are more sharp among Latvian residents.

Commenting on the results of the elections to the local parliament, the secretary of the Central Committee stressed that the communists who make up 57 percent of the deputies are people adhering to different, sometimes directly opposite positions, therefore this figure does not indicate anything. Vagris thinks that the party was not prepared for the elections.

Participants in the rally, which took place on 29 March in the republican capital at the initiative of the United Council of labor collectives, adopted a resolution in which they expressed no confidence in the bureau of the Central Committee Communist Party. In the opinion of the 80,000 people who voted for the document, the bureau of the Central Committee had not led the struggle for the votes, thereby handing power in the local soviets to the people's front. The speakers remarked that the tendency for seceding from the USSR at any price is getting stronger in the republic, and no thought is given to the problem of how to live tomorrow. The participants in the rally expressed their determination to fight for Latvia in a renewed federation.

Latvian Citizens' Committee Support Lithuania

LD0204052690 Riga International Service in Latvian 1730 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] The Citizens' Committee of the Republic of Latvia issued a statement today in which it expressed approval of the Supreme Council of Lithuania for the unyielding resolve in realizing the will of the people to restore actual state independence for Lithuania. The decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and of the USSR

president on restricting the sovereignty of Lithuania and the provocative action of the USSR Armed Forces in the territory of Lithuania were condemned in the statement.

The Citizens' Committee of Lithuania [as heard] also stated that the citizens of the Republic of Latvia are full of resolve to fight for restoration of state power of the republic of Latvia on the basis of legal succession. Increasingly more people, including aliens, join in the activity of the Citizens' Committee of Latvia. Thus, a support committee of the republic of Latvia was founded in Daugavpils in mid-March which represents approximately 800 citizens of other countries, meaning by this the USSR, Lithuanian, and Polish republics, who reside in Daugavpils. These people want to actively join in the process of restoration of independence of the republic of Latvia and to become citizens of the republic of Latvia.

We remark that here at present already more than 800,000 inhabitants of Latvia are being regarded as citizens of the republic of Latvia. From 7 to 12 April, elections to the congress of citizens will take place, but the congress itself will convene on 30 April and 1 May.

Gorbachev Addresses Latvian CP, CPSU Secretaries

LD0404180290 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS—Secretaries of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee today met full and candidate members of the Bureau of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee.

During the frank discussion, it was pointed out that the situation in Latvia is complex and controversial and that a difficult search for the solution of the accumulated problems is taking place.

Issues connected with the strengthening of Latvia's sovereignty and the growth of the Communist Party's role in the social and political life are in the focus of heated debates in the republic.

Participants in the meeting emphasised that the main task of the 25th Congress of the Latvian Communist Party will be to work out a constructive programme of action and on its basis to achieve unity and the consolidation of all forces that really care about the destiny of the republic and its people. The meeting was addressed by Mikhail Gorbachev.

Latvian, Union Communists Meet; Gorbachev Speaks

PM0504090590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Meeting at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] A meeting took place 4 April between CPSU Central Committee secretaries and members and candidate members of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Buro. Questions connected with the upcoming 25th congress of the republic's Communist Party were examined there.

It was pointed out during a frank exchange of opinions that the situation in the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] remains complex and contradictory and that a difficult search is on for ways to resolve the accumulated problems. In this connection questions of strengthening Latvia's sovereignty and enhancing the Communist Party's role in sociopolitical life are being debated particularly sharply.

The participants in the meeting emphasized that the basic task of the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress is to draw up a constructive action program and, on its basis, to achieve the unity and consolidation of all forces which really hold dear the destiny of the republic and its people.

M.S. Gorbachev addressed the meeting.

Split in Latvian Communist Party Seen Imminent

LD0504124890 Moscow TASS in English 1218 GMT 5 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga April 5 TASS—On the eve of its crucial congress in Riga on Friday, the Latvian Communist Party seems certain to do what its colleagues in Lithuania and Estonia have already done—split.

About 800 delegates, representing some 177,000 members, are divided about the future.

Some believe the party should be independent and maintain only "partner relations" with the Soviet Communist Party, while crusading for Latvian independence. They hope to attract about 20,000 Latvian communists, mostly ethnic Latvians.

A more numerous group favours complete independence for their party, but without cutting organisational ties with Soviet communists. They believe Latvian communists should be represented in the Soviet Communist Party's elected bodies and take part in party and social renewal in the Soviet Union.

Surprisingly, a third party emerged on the eve of the congress. It calls itself "the Third Way" and aims to reconcile the first two camps. Proponents of the third way suggest setting up a union of sovereign equal parties coordinated by a small centre. Ethnic feuding will destroy the Marxist movement in Latvia, they warn. About 60 per cent of Latvian communists will not side with any of the first two trends, they believe.

The flood of letters and resolutions and the cast of delegates suggest that the fight will be a hard one.

Only eight per cent of the delegates represent workers and farmers. Most delegates have higher education. Forty-one per cent are Latvians. Ten per cent say they

belong to the People's Front, two side with the Interfront Russian-speakers movement.

The congress is expected to last two days and should its participants "leave through different doors" the Baltics, which have a total population lower than the city of Moscow, will boast six communist parties.

Latvian Deputy Shows Support for Lithuania

LD0404170990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1342 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Speech by Latvian member of parliament (Danis Dansbergis) at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session—live]

[Excerpts] Esteemed deputies, esteemed president, on behalf of the deputies of the Latvian Republic I greet you. [Words indistinct] the people's deputies of Latvia to discuss some questions, including the question of how to support you in your just, difficult, hard struggle for your independence. We must first of all address Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and of course carry out explanatory work among our population and other peoples of the Soviet Union. But in order for us do this fully, we must come to your republic and see what is actualy being done on the spot. We had no doubts that the news coming from you was correct; however, the news coming from the central television channels—you see it yourselves—evokes regret, to put it mildly. [passage omitted]

I want to say that we are fully on your side, and for our part we will do everything possible, everything in our power to ensure that you are not alone. We are united by the common struggle for our independence, and I think that it is our right, the right of any nation to determine how we are to live, and no one should tell us what road we should take. [passage omitted]

I also think that you will agree with me that we do not intend to break off economic and other cultural ties with the Soviet Union, that we want to live in friendship, that we are small peoples, and only by living in friendship can we develop ourselves, and hence we are not threatening anyone, and so the great Soviet Union will not lose if we live as masters of our land.

I wish you all once again patience and hold out to the end. The victory, I feel, will be ours, because our cause is just. Thank you. [applause]

Comparison—'Sajudis' Printing Ban Imposed

LD0304180990

Moscow TASS in English at 1723 GMT on 3 April transmits an item on the printing ban on Lithuanian newspapers headlined "Lithuania: Difficult Road to Democracy and Glasnost." This report has been compared to the translation of the Moscow TASS International Russian version published in the 3 April Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, beginning on page 78, revealing the following variations:

Page 79, column one, second full paragraph, last sentence TASS Russian reads...Lithuanian and Russian.

At the same time publishing house director Aloizas Pivarionas told TASS that "this decision is illegal". He noted that the newspapers "are printed in compliance with contracts signed with them."

He stressed that the publishing house "does not intend to cancel their publication." As for the publication of the SOVETSKAYA LITVA newspaper, the director alleged that it has not been registered, as it is necessary in accordance with the Lithuanian Law on the Press.

There was today a meeting at the Palace of the Press of its workers who protested against the decision which was perceived by them as an "encroachment on democracy" and an attempt "to monopolise information." (supplying additional material)

RSFSR

More on Session of CPSU Russian Bureau

PM0404152390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 90 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau"]

[Text] A session of the CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau was held 3 April to discuss questions relating to preparations for the Russian party conference. Taking part in it were members of the Russian party conference preparatory committee formed from representatives of kray, oblast, and okrug party organizations elected at plenums of the corresponding party committees (one per organization). The committee's members include workers, peasants, representatives of the intelligentsia, and party workers from the Russian Federation. Secretaries of primary and shop party organizations and party group organizers form more than one-third of its number.

Yu.A. Manayenkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, delivered a report to the session. The following took part in the discussion: Yu.M. Aleksandrovich, secretary of the Chelyabinsk CPSU Obkom [Oblast Committee]; A.I. Seleznev, first secretary of Kursk CPSU Obkom; V.A. Tyulkin, secretary of Leningrad's "Avangard" science and production association party committee; V.V. Chikin, chief editor of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA; V.A. Mindolin, first secretary of Novosibirsk city's Sovetskiy CPSU Raykom [Rayon Committee]; M.A. Gasanov, leader of a team of fitters at the Dagestan electrothermal equipment plant; A.S. Arapov, secretary of Gorkiy CPSU Gorkom [City Committee]; N.Zh. Burtsev, electrician at the Ulan-Ude locomotive and railcar repair plant; G.I. Grishchuk, secretary of the Voronezh "Elektronika" science and production association party committee; V.V. Gidaspov, first secretary of

Leningrad CPSU Obkom and Gorkom; N.Kh. Lyubimov, a fitter at the Irkutsk aviation production association; V.A. Kuptsov, first secretary of the Vologda CPSU Obkom; Yu.V. Petrov, secretary of the Tomsk State University party committee; V.I. Vorotnikov, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium; and G.I. Sivets, secretary at the "Izhevskiy Mekhanicheskiy Zavod" production association party committee.

The session adopted a decision to hold the Russian party conference in Moscow 19 June 1990. A plan of basic measures to prepare for the conference was examined and largely approved. Working groups were formed from members of the preparatory committee and, in particular, a special commission was set up to study and generalize the opinions and proposals of party organizations and Communists on questions which are to be examined at the forthcoming Russian party conference.

The session was addressed by M.S. Gorbachev.

Moscow City Soviet Factions Formed

LD0504084290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1529 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, Apr 4 (TASS)—The "Democratic Russia" bloc that unites more than 60 percent of the new membership of the Moscow city Soviet of People's Deputies—Mossovet, has become one of the most influential among the four factions that have been set up within it. People's Deputies Gavril Popov and Sergey Stankevich are among the members of the bloc.

As TASS correspondents report from the Moscow Soviet, more than half of the deputies elected in March are CPSU members. However, only 20 percent of the 464 deputies share the provisions of the pre-election platform of the Moscow CPSU City Committee in full. They set up the second biggest faction—the "Moscow" bloc.

A total of 40 deputies of the Moscow Soviet declared themselves "independent", and ten others set up the "fatherland" bloc that favors preserving Russian national culture and traditions.

Though the factions that have been formed adhere to different positions, their members stress the importance of cooperation so that political differences do not stand in the way of the city authority performing its main tasks. The Moscow Soviet deputies see these tasks as enhancing the standard of living of the capital's residents and ensuring that the city's services and structures function efficiently.

Members of all factions of the Moscow Soviet are represented in proportion to their numbers in the organizational committee for the preparation of the first session of the city soviet of a new convocation. The "Democratic Russia" representatives have received the most—28 seats—on the committee, which has 46 members. The committee has to work out the agenda of the first session, which will define the people's deputies' status and powers, reconsider the structure of the city body of power, and elect a new chairman of the soviet.

'Bandit' Group Neutralized in Moscow

LD0304175390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1218 GMT 3 Apr

[Text] Moscow, 3 Apr (TASS)—A particularly dangerous group of bandits bearing the name "Orda" has been neutralized as a result of joint efforts by staffers of the militia and the KGB in Moscow. Aleksandr Mikhaylov, a KGB spokesman, reported at a briefing held here today that starting in 1988 the criminals, using violence and threats, extorted large sums of money from cooperatives workers and state retail and amenity service enterprise officials in the Kuntsevskiy, Sokolnicheskiy, Perovskiy, and Kievskiy districts of Moscow.

According to KGB information, during this period, "Orda" illegally obtained more than R250,000. Sidearms, illumination flares, tear gas cylinders, eight portable army radio units, the identification card of a militia staffer, a secret telephone communications unit, and valuables worth more than R200,000 were seized from the extortioners.

The investigation continues, after which the criminals will go to court.

More on Vlasov Talk With Union Leader

PM0404155990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Along the Path of Constructive Dialogue"]

[Text] A meeting was held 2 April between A.V. Vlasov, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, and I.Ye. Klochkov, chairman of the Federation of Independent RSFSR Trade Unions [FIRTU]. The federation was recently founded at its constituent congress in Moscow.

During the conversation, the FIRTU chairman expressed his views on the FIRTU draft concept of Russia's economic sovereignty.

In the federation chairman's opinion, it is very important to set up from the outset a smooth and civilized mechanism for collaboration between FIRTU commissions and the republic's government organs. In this context, emphasis was placed on the need to embark on the elaboration of a draft agreement between the RSFSR Government and the trade union center for 1991—a kind of "social contract" which would incorporate a package of measures providing social guarantees for working people as regards the transition to market mechanisms in the economy.

Let us take it for granted that this meeting has already produced agreement between the government and the trade union federation, as if a "protocol of intent" had been signed, A.V. Vlasov said. It is well known that our industry, rejecting ministerial management principles, is moving toward the creation of new structures like consortiums and associations. Joint-stock ownership is emerging, and the integration of science and production is developing. In the complex conditions of structural economic perestroyka, who else but the trade unions should take on the protection of working people and show concern to prevent any infringement of their interests. The government is prepared, in close contact with FIRTU, to formulate joint social programs and to elaborate draft laws promoting the republic's progress and the working people's growing prosperity.

Moscow Political Institute To Train Cadres

PM3003155190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 90 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "New Institute Set Up"]

[Text] The Moscow Political Institute—that is the name of the new educational establishment set up on the basis of the University of Marxism-Leninism and the courses for raising the qualifications of party, soviet, and ideological cadres which have operated hitherto under the capital's CPSU gorkom [city party committee].

"The creation of the institute," A. Zobov, deputy chief of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Ideological Department, said, "is intended to eradicate a certain parallelism in the activity of the University of Marxism-Leninism and the courses and to reflect in the content and forms of party political education the dynamic changes taking place in our society. Through this reorganization we are aiming to speed up our ability to react to changing social awareness, to enhance the quality of the teaching, and to create a scientific base for forecasting political processes and elaborating appropriate recommendations for the capital's party organization. We also hope to achieve a substantial saving in the party budget's funds."

Leningrad Oblast Bureau Reinstates Solovyev

PM0404131290 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 90 p 1

[G. Urushadze report: "Sell the Mercedes and Be Reinstated in the Party"]

[Text] Leningrad—At its session, the Leningrad Oblast Party Committee Bureau, recognizing that a mistake had been made, reinstated Yu.F. Solovyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee and personal pensioner of union significance, in the ranks of the Communist Party.

Six weeks ago he was expelled from the CPSU for what the bureau regarded as a lack of personal modesty. Yuriy Filippovich Solovyev acquired a Western car, a Mercedes, from a secondhand commission store, and this became the subject of an investigation in the Smolnyy.

The fate of the car has yet to be decided: It is most likely to go back to the secondhand store. In any case, Solovyev has been instructed to sell the car...

Green 'Party' Registered in Leningrad

LD0104145690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0830 GMT 1 Apr 90

[Report by TASS Correspondent Konstantin Trifonov]

[Text] Leningrad, 1 Apr (TASS)—Apparently, a "Green" Party and a "Green Party" are not the same thing at all. At the Moskovskiy Rayon Soviet in Leningrad your correspondent was told that the positioning of the inverted commas is not the only difference. The Soviet, according to its officials, has approved the rules of a new public organization called the "Green Party." But the members of the new organization consider that what has been registered is not a public organization at all, but a party with an ecological program.

Why, in fact, are the creators of the new society insisting on the name "party?" Your correspondent asked one of the "Greens" cochairmen, Vladimir Gushchin, to answer this question.

He explained that the ecological situation in Leningrad and the surrounding oblast has become increasingly serious in the last 10 years. In the city there are now about 60 public ecological organizations, ranging from the million-strong Nature Protection Society to the Ecological Research Bureau, consisting of four persons. But not one of them has any real powers. Not one of them can operate on a national level. Without this the natural environment simply cannot be protected. Therefore, says Vladimir Gushchin, at the end of 1988 we began to form a "Green" party, to which 17 ecological groups now belong.

The principal difference between the "green" party, which the Soviet has still not recognized as a party, and other organizations is that it will regard ecological problems in the context of legal, economic and other problems. The party considers itself to be a part of the international "Green" movement. Following the example of its overseas colleagues it has decided to make its structure as democratic as possible. Therefore, it currently has three cochairmen.

As regards those wretched inverted commas, the Leningrad "Greens" consider that now, following the revocation of Article 6 of the Soviet Constitution guaranteeing the CPSU's leading role, the CPSU too is only regarded in law as a party because of its rules, which are not actually a legislative document. So, Vladimir Gushchin and his friends believe that even before the adoption of a special law on public organizations and parties, parties can be created on the basis of their rules. They are convinced that Soviet laws do not prohibit this.

This is a legal dispute which only lawyers can resolve. But more important than this is the fact that the Leningrad public are seriously prepared to rectify the ecological situation in their city.

Baklanov Meets With Workers in Zelenograd

LD2803215290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 28 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by S. Medvedev, identified by screen caption]

[Excerpts] In Zelenograd near Moscow, Comrade Baklanov, CPSU Central Committee secretary, had a meeting with representatives of the town's labor collectives.

[Medvedev] [passage omitted] [video shows town scenes; Baklanov addressing meeting] As you have probably understood, there were many questions and rather sharp polemics about the published CPSU platform. Comrade Baklanov singled out five provisions on which the Central Committee disagrees with the authors of the democratic platform. These are, in brief: First, the socialist revolution was not a historic mistake. Second, the Central Committee is opposed to removing the party organization from enterprises. Renunciation of democratic centralism could change the party into a discussion club. Fourth, the Central Committee is opposed to factions. Finally it will not permit the CPSU to be turned into a parliamentary-type party.

There was a discussion and that means that not all the participants in the meeting share these theses. Well, today, that is the political reality and once again confirms that at the upcoming 28th CPSU Congress there will be no easy decisions.

More on Meeting

PM2903150990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Meeting in Zelenograd"]

[Text] A meeting was held 27 March between O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and representatives of labor collectives in Zelenograd enterprises.

The concept, initiated by the party gorkom [city committee] and taken up by the public, of creating a high tech city—a technopolis—and synchronizing the pace of revolutionary perestroyka of society and of the scientific and technical revolution, is acquiring specific forms in this part of the capital. The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet government attach major importance to the implementation of this concept. The Zelenograd residents have established and strengthened business-like contacts with them.

The meeting of the CPSU Central Committee secretary with workers, scientists, specialists, and party and soviet workers in Zelenograd near Moscow was held within the framework of this ongoing dialogue. He shared his thoughts on the concepts with which the party is approaching its 28th congress and on progress in discussing the Central Committee precongress platform, and his views of the "Democratic Platform." A great deal of attention was paid to an analysis of the radical reforms of perestroyka which are designed to radically renew the life of society, and to the implementation of the possibilities they open up.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary answered the Zelenograd residents' questions.

First 'Roundtable' Session in Yaroslavl Reported

PM2903135590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Mikhail Ovcharov dispatch under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Dialogue Opened"]

[Text] Yaroslavl—The first "roundtable" session opened in Yaroslavl. Party and soviet leaders and heads of numerous informal social movements met for the first time.

The "roundtable" participants include the People's Front, the "Green Branch" Club, the "Memorial" Society, the United Front of the Working People, the Council of Social Organizations, the Party Club, and others. It cannot be claimed that the discussion passed smoothly, without a flareup of emotions. But it laid the groundwork for a constructive dialogue between social organizations proceeding from various platforms. The "roundtable" participants managed to reach one main conclusion: Sessions of this kind must be held systematically, fruitless polemics about diverging opinions in respect of political and economic processes must be avoided, and a vigorous effort must be made to identify factors which can lead to a consensus. Priority tasks to be discussed at future sessions were defined. They include ensuring full power for the soviets, solving pressing social problems and primarily the food problem, and developing glasnost and democracy.

Penalties Increased for Trade Violations

90UN1105A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Mar 90 First Edition p 1

[Report on interview with First Deputy RSFSR Minister of Justice Yu.D. Severin by unnamed TASS correspondent: "Criminal Profiteering"; date and place not specified]

[Text] The press has published the ukase of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium "On Increasing Penalties for Abuses in Trade and Speculation." In conjunction with this, a TASS correspondent has met with First Deputy RSFSR Minister of Justice Yu.D. Severin.

[TASS] Yuriy Dmitriyevich, what is the reason for issuing this document?

[Severin] Due to the worsening situation in the consumer market, negative phenomena in the distribution of goods in short supply have become common in the republic; violations of trade rules have become more frequent. For example, administrative penalties for violating trade rules were imposed on 2.5 times more trade and public catering employees last year than in 1988. During the same period, the incidence of trade at unauthorized locations increased by 84 percent. A similar situation is registered in Leningrad and other regions of the Russian Federation.

Speculative sales of consumer goods have become widespread. Organized groups have appeared which are engaged in purchasing and reselling them. Meanwhile, the law did not provide for increased penalties for such unlawful phenomena.

In 1988-1989 the number of those penalized for speculation by the courts through administrative procedures increased from 23,000 to 34,000. This, however, has not resulted in an improved situation. It has become profitable for some people to continue their speculation activities after paying a small fine because their profits covered the loss.

This prompted the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to adopt the Ukase "On Increasing Penalties for Abuses in Trade and Speculation" on 27 February 1990.

[TASS] What is new in this ukase of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium?

[Severin] Taking into account the proposals of local soviets of people's deputies and numerous letters from workers, the ukase has substantially increased the fines for violating the law in the sphere of trade; a provision has been made to more extensively use the confiscation of assets of those found guilty and to prohibit their work in positions or involvement in activities which are associated with the management of material valuables. Other sanctions have also been reinforced.

Specifically, fines imposed through administrative procedures for the sale of goods from storage facilities, warehouses, and stock rooms of enterprises (organizations) of trade and public catering or the withholding of merchandise from the customers by the employees of trade or public catering who are not officials have increased 10-fold (from R50 to R500), and for a repeat offense (which previously was not envisaged) to R1,000.

Please note that the commission of the actions in question by an official using his official position entails criminal penalties immediately. The penalty for this has been increased from corrective labor to one year of deprivation of freedom, and the fine from R500 to R1,000. Deprivation of freedom has been introduced as a penalty for such actions if they are committed repeatedly or on the basis of prior collusion.

Sales of goods from storage facilities, warehouses, and stock rooms, or withholding them from customers, which are perpetrated on a large scale (R2,000 or more) or by persons with a previous court record is punishable by the deprivation of freedom for up to seven years or a fine of between R3,000 and R5,000. Even stiffer measures (deprivation of freedom for 10 years) are envisaged for the same actions committed on a particularly large scale (in the amount of R2,500 or more). The old law contained no such provision.

Fines of up to R300, that is, three times higher than before, and in the case of a repeat offense, of up to R1,000 (the amount has been increased five-fold) are envisaged for petty speculation. Such penalties are imposed when the size of the gain does not exceed R100. If it exceeds R100 as a result of speculative activities this entails criminal penalties for the individual violating the law.

Increased penalties have been envisaged for speculation in keeping with prior collusion or by an organized group of people, as well as speculation with the use of state, cooperative, or other public forms.

[TASS] When will the ukase take effect? In your opinion, what is its significance in fighting speculation as a social plague?

[Severin] The ukase took effect on the date of publication. It was published in the central press, including SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, on 2 March. This means that individuals committing violations of the law after 2 March should be held responsible under the new ukase.

Undoubtedly, the ukase of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium will become an important measure for putting trade in order until the shortage of consumer goods is overcome which should eliminate the problem of violations of trade rules and speculation all by itself. However, it is important to see that combating speculation and violations of trade rules is the business of not only the law enforcement organs but also of the soviets of people's deputies, trade departments, and the entire populace.

Raykom Secretary Questions Election Defeat

PM2203103590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by Valentina Nikolayeva under the rubric "Direct Line; IZVESTIYA Own Correspondents at the Teleprinter": "First Secretary Became Angry...."]

[Text] Saratov—Failing to be elected a deputy to the rayon soviet, A. Gladenin, first secretary of the Yershovskiy party raykom [rayon committee], did not find within himself the strength to endure the defeat with dignity.

The first secretary did not believe that the 282 inhabitants of Perekopnoye village, where he was running, could voluntarily cross out his name from their ballot slips.

That is why party raykom instructors I. Surkova and G. Grebennikova were sent to the 41st electoral okrug immediately after the election. Taking copies of the electoral register, they went round a number of households to find out from people who had voted against the first secretary and why. A parallel study—on the work of the precinct electoral commission—was conducted in the village by V. Izvekov, chairman of the Yershov City Soviet executive committee.

On the basis of "an on-the-spot study of the reasons why the first secretary failed to be elected deputy," I. Surkova wrote an extensive document. It sharply criticized the party committee and board of the V.I. Lenin collective farm and also the candidate deputy's agents and the agitation and political information workers who "failed to conduct explanatory work." It also criticized the precinct electoral commission which (I quote) "for some incomprehensible reason displayed callousness and indifference toward the candidate deputy for the 41st electoral okrug and irresponsibility toward its obligations...." I. Surkova also accused the raykom bureau members who displayed "indifference toward what had happened" and "a lack of involvement in Comrade Gladenin's further fate as the rayon leader."

This document was dubbed "Statement of the action group of party, soviet, and economic workers to the members of the Yershovskiy CPSU Raykom" in the raykom and was presented for signing to the leaders of the rayon's enterprises whom A. Gladenin assembled specially for the purpose (Surkova herself visited some of them to get their signatures). Thirty six people signed the paper. Many of them, with whom I talked, believed that they were thus supporting the first secretary's wish to run once more for the rayon soviet for one of the vacated okrugs.

There is no denying that Comrade Gladenin is now in a difficult moral position. Sessions of the rayon soviets are continuing in the oblast. First secretaries of party raykoms are being elected chairmen of the rayon soviets—to the highest official post in a rayon. But he is losing power.... That is why he is fighting for power with dubious methods. Sometimes causing anger and irony in the rayon. The raykom bureau is meeting to hear the report of the chairman of the rayon electoral commission. The publication of the item on the election results is delayed for several days in the local press and on rayon radio is an interview with the first secretary on the subject of whether he has any grievances or complaints regarding the electors who "kicked him out?"

According to Ye. Morkovin, chairman of the rayon soviet executive committee, he was ordered to defer the assembly of newly elected deputies for the first session.... And when the session took place nonetheless (the 36-year-old collective farm director V. Kosso was elected rayon soviet chairman at it) the first secretary ignored the invitation and did not appear for the sitting....

New ASSR Supreme Soviet Chairman, Premier

PM0504081790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by own correspondent M. Mikhalkov: "Government Formed"]

[Text] Nalchik—The first session of the newly elected autonomous republic Supreme Soviet has been held in Kabardino-Balkaria. Some organizational matters were decided at the session. Party oblast committee [obkom] first secretary V.M. Kokov was elected chairman of the Kabardino-Balkar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] Supreme Soviet by secret ballot. The deputies confirmed M.Sh. Mamkhegov as chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers.

The session adopted a decision on the finalization of the autonomous entity's Constitution in the very near future and amendment of some of its articles to ensure that representatives of all the peoples inhabiting its territory have parity in government organs.

Northern Ethnic Group Privileges Introduced

LD0304083890 Moscow TASS in English 0717 GMT 3 Apr 90

[Text] Nikolayevsk-on-Amur April 3 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Aleksandr Rosugbu:

The "Nizhneamurets" cooperative, which unites Nivkhs, Ulchis and other small northern ethnic groups, have been freed from paying state taxes by the local authorities.

According to the law, the cooperative, involved in fishing and construction, had to allocate up to 20 per cent of its earnings to the local budget. However, taking into account the importance of the revival of fishing, land and sea hunting, the local council allowed the cooperative to keep all of its profits.

"The recent congress of northern ethnic groups in Moscow stressed the need to help them normalise their economy," Cooperative Chairman Pyotr Kondinko said.

"The extra money will be used to restore the kol settlement—the native nomad camp of ethnic Nivkh Pozvein, the guide of Admiral Gennadiy Nevelskiy, researcher of the far east. The cooperative will build housing, a fishing base and a fish processing plant there."

Fishing, hunting, and other areas are now being transferred to taiga and tundra aborigines in the Khabarovsk region, where eight out of 26 northern ethnic groups reside.

Evenks and Negidaltsi have received a large Taiga area, rich in sable, along the Amgun River. A spawning river in the Tatar Strait area has been granted to Orochi. The Okhotsk forest tundra has been given to local reindeer breeders.

Komi Working People's Union Formed

PM1303143590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by Viktor Filippov under the rubric "Direct Line: IZVESTIYA Own Correspondents at the Teleprinter": "Union of Inta Working People Created"]

[Text] Komi ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]—Representatives of the labor collectives of the miners' city of Inta have held a constituent meeting which approved the statute and program statement of a new organization born of the workers' movement.

The floor was given to V. Solnyshkin, chairman of the coordinating council of the Union of Inta Working People and a mine worker at the "Zapadnaya" mine's stope:

"We are coming out for full economic independence for enterprises, the democratization of their management, and the ultimate assertion of a new economic order based on commodity-money relations."

"The charter defines the union as a sociopolitical organization. What are your political aims?"

"Full power of the people through the soviets, a multiparty system, the depoliticization of the court and prosecutor's office, armed forces, Ministry of Internal Affairs, and KGB... In brief, everything which serves the development of democracy and rules out the usurping of power in the country."

"By what means do you intend to seek these goals?"

"We want to cooperate with all organizations operating within the framework of the USSR Constitution. We allow meetings, demonstrations, and protests..."

Sakhalin, Kurile Residents Hold Conference

LD0404122490 Moscow TASS in English 1129 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Yuzho-Sakhalinsk April 4 TASS—By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Belovitskiy:

Hundreds of residents of the Sakhalin and Kurile islands, who are concerned about the serious situation in the economy of the Soviet Far East, the imbalance of its market and shortages of goods, took part in the founding conference of the movement for the socio-economic renewal of the Sakhalin and Kurile Islands here on Tuesday [3 April].

They called for all progressively-minded and imaginative residents of Sakhalin region irrespective of their ideological and theoretical views and persuasions, to join the new organisation.

Participants in the conference believe that discussions involving representatives of various political forces will help the new organisation elaborate and implement an effective programme for the development of the region.

They said that all projects by economists and scientists should be carried out in the region only after their thorough examination by the movement for the socio-economic renewal of Sakhalin and Kurile Islands.

Issues of foreign economic ties, attracting foreign capital and setting up joint ventures will be central to the movement.

Small Peoples of North Congress Ends

LD3103213190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 31 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] The Congress of the Small Peoples of the North ended today in Moscow's Great Kremlin Palace. Three hundred and thirty-seven delegates representing 26 peoples, numbering in total a little more than 180,000, discussed the pressing problems of social and economic development, ecology, and the preservation of their national culture.

Incidentally, many guests, representatives of international organizations and small peoples from Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, the U.S. and Canada, attended the congress and called in their speeches for cooperation between the northern peoples of our country and these states to expand. Important decisions were adopted at the congress. This report from our correspondent brings

[Correspondent Leonid Kushnarenko] The representatives of the indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East announced at the congress the creation of an Association of the Small Peoples of the North. Its aim, to brief, is to unite forces in the struggle for the survival of the unique civilization of the North. The tasks of the association are also to obtain the ratification by the USSR Supreme Soviet of a convention on the indigenous and tribal peoples and independent countries adopted last year by the international labor conference. [passage omitted]

As a legal body, the association does, naturally, have the means to create enterprises and organizations and the authority as well as its own press mouthpiece. Let me note as a parenthesis that this function is currently that of SEVERNYYE PROSTORY magazine [NORTHERN SPACES]. The congress also elected a president of the association. [passage omitted] [video shows Kushnarenko holding up typed copies of the congress declaration and the charter of the association; delegates to the congress; Ryzhkov, Gorbachev, Medvedev, and Vorotnikov shown in the president; more shots of delegates; Vorotnikov seen but not heard at the rostrum; Gayer group talks in the foyer; copy of SEVERNYYE PROSTORY held up; people in native costume; close-up of Sangi giving interview.]

Benzex Poisoning Suspected After Cistern Leak

LD2803121390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2028 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] On Oktyabrskiy Railway, alas, another disaster, this time very serious. Some five tonnes of benzex leaked into Kolp River from a damaged cistern 40 km from Kaduy settlement, Vologda Oblast. It is suspected that the contents of the cistern have already poisoned five teenagers who took water for their tea from the river while fishing. Symptoms similar to those of benzex poisoning have also been found in two women living on the banks of the river, and one of the bulldozer drivers working on the site of the accident has been taken to the hospital. The leak of benzex from the cistern has been stopped, but it has not yet been pumped back into other containers. A dike is now being built to stop the rest of the poison from getting into the river.

Western Republics

Ukrainian Rallies Held for Lithuanian Support

LD0404161190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1233 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] The independent daily news bulletin GLASNOST reports that on 31 March there were rallies in many cities of the Ukraine in support of the independent Lithuanian Republic. According to preliminary data, says the Moscow bulletin, over 250,000 people took part in vigils of solidarity with Lithuania, despite the fact that the Council of Ministers and Central Committee of the UKrainian Communist Party had issued a statement banning rallies and demonstrations. The daily GLASNOST reports that rallies attended by many thousands of people in support of Lithuanian independence were also held in Kiev, Ivan-Frankovsk, Ternopol, [word indistinct] Krivoy Rog, Nikolayev, and other cities of the Ukraine.

The independent agency (INSOVVZGLYAD) reports that on 1 April there was a demonstration in Makhachkala, capital of Daghestan, in support of the decision of the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic proclaiming independence and sovereignty. According to the report of the (INSOVVZGLYAD) agency, a picket was arranged on the city's central square, with several dozen people taking part.

Rukh Appeal Backs Lithuanian Independence

LD2803171190 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 28 Mar 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day By Day" program]

[Text] The fourth session of the Great Rada—the grand council of Rukh, the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka—which has been held in the town of Khust in Transcarpathian Oblast, has adopted an appeal to the people of the Lithuanian Republic and all peoples of the USSR. It supports the decisions of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet in its aspiration for independence and condemns the decision by the Third Congress of People's Deputies and the subsequent decree by USSR President Gorbachev on Lithuania, as violating the sovereign rights of the people. The participants in the session did not support the statement by their 22 leaders about creating a new party on the Rukh platform. An INTERFAX correspondent also reports that the session rescinded the decision by the Rukh secretariat on holding an extraordinary congress.

2d-Round Elections Include Rayon 1st Secretary

LD0603145290 Kiev in Ukrainian to North America 2200 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Excerpts] In many constituencies in the Ukraine, the candidates failed to poll the sufficient numbers of votes; and, as prescribed by the election rules, they will stand in the second round on 18 March. [passage omitted]

Among them will be Boris Soldatenko, first secretary of the Leningrad party rayon committee in Kiev. [passage omitted]

Ivashko Addresses Ukrainian Gorkom, Raykom Heads

PM0504080590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by own correspondents M. Odinets and I. Tikhomirov: "Secretaries Consult"]

[Text] Kiev, 30 Mar—A conference of the first secretaries of Ukrainian Communist Party city and rayon committees was held here today. It discussed party organizations' tasks in preparing for the 28th CPSU Congress and the 28th Ukrainian Communist Party Congress and carrying out reports and elections.

The conference was addressed by V.A. Ivashko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

Komsomol Issues Appeal on Youth Demonstration

LD0504071490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1725 GMT 25 Apr 90

[Text] Kiev, 4 Apr (RATAU-TASS)—The Ukrainian Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee Bureau has issued an appeal to work collectives, party, komsomol and public organizations of Kiev and all the Ukraine and to the young men and women of the republic in connection with the unsanctioned demonstration in Kiev on 1 April this year by the Union of Independent Ukrainian Youth (SNUM).

The results of the demonstration, the appeal says, have far-reaching political consequences. The column of almost 200 persons broke through a militia cordon, deliberately stopped road traffic, carried out provocative

actions outside the garrison military commandant's office, blockaded militia vehicles, insulted staff members of the law enforcement bodies and hoisted a blue and yellow flag over the premises of the city soviet executive committee. All these actions were perpetrated under read and black flags—the symbols of OUN [Association of Ukrainian nationalists) and its armed formations. Children were used in the unlawful actions.

The SNUM action was openly directed by the UKhS (Ukrainian Helsinki Union).

The Ukrainian Komsomol Central Committee Bureau considers it necessary to reaffirm its intention of striving to achieve the broadest opportunities for freely publicizing viewpoints and convictions, including in the form of rallies and demonstrations. At the same time the bureau considers justified the refusal to allow the SNUM to hold the rally.

In the situation that has arisen the Ukrainian Komsomol Central Committee Bureau has called on the republic's working people and youth to rise to the defense of civil peace and national unanimity and not to give in to the provocation of those who attempt to exploit youthful optimism and romance for unseemly goals.

IAEA Experts To Monitor Chernobyl Effects

LD0404142890 Kiev International Service in English 2330 GMT 3 Apr 90

[From the "Human Factor" program, presented by Maryna Voyna]

[Text] [Voyna] Here is my colleague Galina Kozlyuk with her story:

[Kozlyuk] Visiting the Ukraine was a group of experts of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and other authoritative world organizations, headed by Maurice Rozen, director of the nuclear safety department. Our aim, said Maurice Rozen, during the meeting which took place at the Ukrainain SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, is to find out the radiation doses received by the population and to determine the current condition of its health. This will allow to work out measures which will ensure safe living conditions for the people in the areas affected by radiation.

The time has at last come for us and for international experts to tell themselves and the world the truth, that the greatest technological catastrophe in the entire history of the earth occurred in Chernobyl, and it is only today that we begin to realize its consequences. Today one can talk only about the adaptation of a human being, the entire biosphere, to a new post-Chernobyl condition.

Residing in the disaster area on the contaminated territories are millions of people. The Chernobyl catastrophe has put before them complicated tasks which concern actually all spheres of life, many fields of science and production, morals, and ethics. Unfortunately these people do not receive proper aid from the government of the republic and the union government. Living on the contaminated lands are both adults and children. Produce grown on this territory is unfit for consumption. The population is not provided with clean food products and medicines. The condition of people's health evokes great anxiety. Medical workers, the public, and newsmen are raising alarm.

Quite recently one more public organization came into being under the aegis of the Popular Movement of the Ukraine for Restructuring and the Green World Association. The name of this new organization is the Salvation Society. It involves representatives of the Ukrainian regions which suffered most from the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant.

One of the founders of this organization, Valentyn Budko, the newly elected people's deputy of the Ukraine from the Narodichi district, said the following in an interview for Radio Kiev:

[Begin Budko recording in Ukrainian with superimposed English translation] Before it is too late, all the land in the area of the accident, every hectare of it, must be thoroughly examined. The health of the people must be checked so that there should be a certain degree of confidence in their future. Our problems must be solved in the following way:

In case further living area is inadmissable, the entire population of the district must be resettled to some other place, and not only the young people. But it is impossible to leave people of the contaminated areas to be a kind of live radiation counter themselves, said Valentyn Budko, first secretary of the Narodichi district committee of the Communist Party. [end recording]

Caucasus

MVD Spokesman on Armenian-Azerbaijan Situation

LD0304170690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 3 Apr 90

[Text] A spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] press center reports that work aimed at normalizing the situation that has arisen in the rayons near the border between the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and Armenian SSR is continuing. In accordance with a decision by the USSR Supreme Soviet on 5 March 1990 on the situation on the Azerbaijan and Armenian SSR's and measures to normalize the situation in this region, the internal affairs bodies of the Azerbaijan SSR, in conjunction with Internal Troops and attached forces of the USSR MVD, are systematically implementing a set of measures aimed at the confiscation and voluntary handing-in of weapons and ammunition throughout the territory of the republic. Between 26 March and 2 April 1990, more than 150 firearms were confiscated from or voluntarily handed in by organizations, institutions, enterprises, and the public. As reported by Lieutenant-Colonel Zinovyev,

spokesman for a military operational group of the Internal Troops of the USSR MVD, similar measures also are being carried out on the territory of the Armenian SSR. Work in this area is continuing.

Armenians Reportedly Fire on Azerbaijani Towns

NC0404191390 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] The situation remains tense in the towns of Gedebeyskiy Rayon bordering Armenia. Armed Armenians have fired on the towns of Mormor and Dortlyar and tried to steal cattle. However, units of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry troops arrived at the places where the incidents occurred and thwarted the activities of the Armenians.

Attacks Reported on Servicemen in Armenia

PM0404140590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Apr 90 First Edition p 4

[Report by telephone by correspondent Lieutenant Colonel V. Kaushanskiy under the rubric "Direct Line": "Armenia: Extremists Are Not Calming Down"]

[Text] 2 Apr—Passions had still not abated after the unprecedented attack in Armenia on a guard detail on the night of 28-29 March (KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has already described this incident to readers) before an alarming new report came in from Yerevan of an attack on servicemen with a view to seizing their weapons.

At 0100 hours on the night of 2 April a group of civilians (14 men, according to preliminary figures) armed with submachineguns and pistols penetrated the territory of a military town and disarmed Senior Ensign A. Sarkisyan, the unit duty officer. Then the attackers charged into the barracks in the hope of seizing the arms storage room. I shall say immediately that they did not get to the rifles. In the confusion they did not find them and, feeling time was running out, they hastily retreated, taking with them the orderly's knife. An investigation is under way into this flagrant sortie by the extremists.

Weapons... How many of them are loose in Armenia, stolen from the departments of military higher educational establishments, taken from the republican internal security guards, and plundered in Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy institutions. Now, increasingly insolent, the extremists are rushing to the thresholds of military units. There have been four incidents in the past 10 days. And after all the stolen guns are not lying silent, the explosives removed from the depots are not a dead load. Their "voices" can be heard on the border with Azerbaijan and on the roads of Nagorno-Karabakh. Never mind Karabakh, functionaries from the Armenian Pan-national Movement are rampaging with weapons through the streets of Yerevan. And calls are already being heard for no special consideration to be shown toward those people who are inconvenient.

For instance, on 30 and 31 March some hotheads from the Armenian Pan-national Movement in the center of the Armenian capital gave instructions to use weapons "against the Soviet army of occupation" if it interfered in the actions of the Armenian thugs. It was also said out loud that "the Armenian Pan-national Movement intends to seize power and must take power from the communists and pass it on to the people" during the forthcoming elections. It is time to ask how they intend to "take" power—with or without gunfire?

It is clear to whom these appeals are addressed but who will be the hostage of the extremist games? Totally innocent people will have to pay for this, as has already frequently happened. And pay with their lives. And in this situation what is to become of the servicemen serving in the checkpoints of units stationed on Armenian territory? What are they to expect of those who come to their gates?..

When Colonel P. Strembovskiy, officer of the Transcaucasus Military District staff, told me the details of the recent piratical attack on servicemen, in April this time, he deemed it necessary to emphasize the following:

"In Yerevan today some people would very much like to subject the military to psychological pressure from the thugs and to provoke them. Nonetheless the units' checkpoints will not be a wall dividing servicemen and the civilian population. We have sought and will seek to strengthen the traditional friendship with the people of fraternal Armenia. But measures to sober up those who love provocations will be made. Let the attackers have no illusions on that score this time."

Will those who have taken the bit between their teeth understand this and listen to the voice of reason?

Yerevan Reports Rail Blockade Continuing

NC0404140590 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 3 Apr 90

[Report by Rafik Grigoryan: "Again Silence on the Railways"—recorded]

[Excerpt] [Grigoryan] One does not have to be a prophet to realize that the blockade would resume at some time. This is going to keep happening as long as those interested in the blockade resume it after instigating any kind of interethnic provocation after having suspended it briefly when they become bored. The blockade undoubtedly suits those higher up who do not care if it is a blow to the very heart of the country and accelerates its further economic disintegration. There is again an ominous silence on the railways and nothing good can come of it. The silence is particularly noticeable at the Yerevan station where the rail tracks are becoming rusty with disuse. I am again speaking with Nikolay Ter-Karapetyan, party secretary at the Yerevan station. Comrade Karapetyan, it has been four days since our

previous meeting and we know that the blockade is continuing. What can you tell our listeners? What is new at the railways?

[Karapetyan] Interest in this issue is natural because it concerns the vital interests of our people as the railways are the pulse of our city. Therefore, the people want to know the situation at the four stations of Arabkir, Kanaker, Karmir-Blur, and Yerevan, the last of which is the main station. Therefore the attention of the people and the work collectives is directed to Yerevan station. At present I have no good news to give. I must say that the blockade, which is the fourth, is continuing under conditions which are grave for us. [passage omitted]

Armenian Economic Autonomy Draft Published

PM0404152590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[Own correspondent A. Sarkisyan dispatch: "Which Direction Is the Best?"]

[Text] Yerevan—The draft concept of Armenian economic independence discussed by the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau has been published in the republic newspapers for broad discussion.

It is proposed to introduce the principle of free enterprise affirming the right of collectives of enterprises, social organizations, and individual citizens to conduct any economic activity, with the exception of instances contravening republic legislation.

It is intended that Armenia should have economic ties with Soviet republics and with foreign organizations and enterprises on the basis of the principles of openness, partnership, and integration with the world economic system. The principle of market self-regulation combined with specially targeted, programmatic planning is seen as a priority.

While proposing a multiplicity of forms of ownership, the authors of the concept make the distinction between republic ownership, local soviet ownership, ownership by social organizations, and cooperative, joint-stock, private, individual, and joint ownership. It is intended to transfer ownership of agricultural land to the peasants if they should wish it: for an indefinite period, as a rule.

"We realize how difficult the road to an independent economy is," G. Arutyunyan, head of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Socioeconomic Policy Department and one of the authors of the concept, said. "But, if we want to conduct a mutually advantageous, equitable economic policy, there is no other way. We are in favor of reasonable integration. In the modern world, isolation dooms any nation to stagnation."

Armenia's Arutyunyan Chairs Emergency Council

NC3003085890 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0600 GMT 30 Mar 90

[Text] Suren Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, chaired the republican council on the state of emergency on 29 March. The meeting heard reports about the situation in the republic from Movsisyan, chairman of the operational staff; Usik Arutyunyan, internal affairs minister of the Armenian Republic; Aleksandrov, first deputy chairman of the Committee for State Security of the Armenian Republic; and Nazaryan, procurator of the Armenian Republic.

The previous week was characterized by a sharp exacerbation of the situation in the Armenian Republic's regions bordering Azerbaijan. An extremely complex and alarming situation has developed in Araratskiy, Vaykskiy, Noyemberyanskiy, and Shamshadinskiy rayons. Because of irresponsible elements on both sides, a number of armed clashes occurred, resulting in casualties among the local peaceful population. The blockade of the rail transportation into the republic has resumed. Enormous difficulties have again arisen in the supply of foodstuffs to the population and raw materials, power, and energy sources to the enterprises and public economy.

The republican, local party organization, and soviet law enforcement bodies are taking urgent measures to stabilize the situation. The party rayon committees and party rayon executive committees, in cooperation with the party aktiv and public organizations, must take resolute measures to stabilize the situation and not allow it to go uncontrolled. First of all, more attention must be paid to keeping law and order, and passions and emotions must not become inflamed. Any provocative act might bring about unpredictable consequences, and end in bloodshed and more victims.

The participants in the meeting were uneasy because the attacks to seize arms are not ending and the formation of armed teams is continuing. All these pose a certain social danger, particularly because criminals possess some of the stolen arms and use them for criminal activities. Therefore, it is extremely important that the compulsory return of arms, ammunition, explosive materials, and military uniforms be secured. Operative and active measures must be taken in this direction. Enormous responsibility falls on the republic's mass media which is obligated to assist in forming public opinion in this regard.

Considering the explosive situation in the republic and the region, the council found it appropriate to make an appeal to the population of the republic. The council ratified urgent measures to stabilize the situation in the republic, reduce tension, and resolve the situation.

Members and candidate members of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau took part in the meeting.

Armenian Movement Leader on Ties With Socialists

NC0404145090 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 3 Apr 90

[Interview with Levon Ter-Petrosyan, president of the Administrative Board of the Armenian Pan-national Movement and member of the Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium, by Levon Ananikyan—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Ananikyan] Mr. Ter-Petrosyan, you recently returned from French Socialist Party congress in France. Please tell us about the congress.

[Ter-Petrosyan] The French Socialist Party extended an invitation to its congress to the Armenian Pan-national Movement. Babken Araktsyan and I went to the party congress from 12 to 18 March in Rheims, France. We were among the foreign guests there, which included Lithuanians, Estonians, and Moscow Social Democrats. In addidion to our delegation, a large delegation from the Armenian Revolutionary Federation [Dashnaktsutyun] was there. It always participates in such congresses because it is socialist. [passage omitted].

[Ananikyan] There are many public and political organizations in the Transcaucasian republics, yet the French socialists invited only the Armenian Pan-national Movement. Why?

[Ter-Petrosyan] First, there are differing attitudes in the West toward our movement and the Azerbaijanian Popular Front. Our movement is considered democratic and progressive, whereas the Azerbaijan Popular Front is regarded as reactionary because of the atrocities in Azerbaijan. Regarding Georgia, there are numerous political and public organizations but no unifying force within the republic like the Armenian Pan-national Movement or even the Azerbaijan Popular Front. This explains why we were given the privilege. [passage omitted on contacts with various European parliamentarians]

The Armenian Pan-national Movement and European socialist parties held practical talks on broadening and continuing cooperation, and with the prospect of the Armenian Pan-national Movement's membership in the Socialist International. They were very positively disposed towards this proposal and Louis Ayala, secretary of the Socialist International from Chile, proposed that we participate in the upcoming meeting of Socialist International in Cairo on 22 May. As for a general assessment of these contacts, we have no great expectations. We should not place our hope on the West, but should rely on our own forces. In general, the West will never take us seriously if we are not a real political force. Despite that, I give certain importance to these meetings and relations, because as a state—no matter what type of state it is—we must come out of the political isolation imposed on our republic for the last 70 years and we should gradually enter international relations and effectively lay the foundations for our independent state. This is our objective in establishing international relations.

[Ananikyan] It is imperative today that all the political forces of our people unite around a single objective, or at least should cooperate with the Armenian Pan-national Movement.

[Ter-Petrosyan] During the conference we met the leaders of Dashnaktsutyun, but it was only a perfunctory meeting. The Dashnaktsutyun delegation was composed of Marughyan and Henri Papazyan, both members of the Dashnaktsutyun party bureau; and Jules Martirosyan and Varuzhan Grigoryan, members of the party's Central Committee in France. We had no serious talks about political issues. But when I was in France six months ago I had serious talks with a number of Dashnaktsutyun party members, including Marughyan, Henri Papazyan, and Jules Martirosyan. The same political confusion that exists to some extent toward the movement and its objectives in Armenia exists to a greater exteny in the diaspora. The basic factor is that the traditional diaspora parties, that is Dashnaktsutyun, Hnchak party, and Ramkavars, could not understand the alignment of the movement or comprehend its essence. However, that does not mean the diaspora is not correctly assessing our movement. There are huge masses and healthy forces in the diaspora who are unreservedly on the side of the movement and are doing and will do everything to support it. [passage omitted]

Georgia's Nuclear Reactor Shut Down

LD0404222290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2017 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] In the past few days many events have been happening in Georgia. Nona Gongadze reported today that by a decision of the republic's Academy of Sciences, the operation of the nuclear reactor of the Georgian Physics Institute in the environs of the republic's ancient capital of Mtskheta was brought to a halt today.

[Gongadze] The decision was taken at the insistent demand of the public of the Mtskheta and nearby rayons of Georgia who consider inexpedient the existence of a nuclear installation in such a densely populated region which, moreover, is rich in invaluable historical monuments. The reactor started operating almost three decades ago and helped Georgia's physicists carry out a number of important research projects. Even though during the time of its existence—and this has been proved—it did not cause any harm either to people or the environment. [sentence as received] Georgia's physicists regard the shutdown of the reactor as a great loss, but not a catastrophe for the further development of research in this important area of learning. [video shows location of reactor at the bottom of a mountain and then footage inside the reactor building: the machinery and the reactor itself]

Recent Events in Georgia Examined

PM3003130390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by TASS special correspondent V. Dzhibuti: "Situation in Georgia"]

[Text] Tbilisi-Moscow—On 9 March the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet admitted that "the introduction fo Soviet Russia's troops into Georgia in February 1921 and the occupying of its entire territory was from the legal viewpoint military interference (intervention) and occupation with a view to overthrowing the existing political system and from the political viewpoint it was annexation." The republic's Supreme Soviet "declared illegal and void the 21 May 1921 union worker and peasant treaty between the Georgian SSR and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and the 12 March 1922 union treaty on the formation of the federative Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of the Transcaucasus."

The session also decided "to begin talks on the restoration of an independent Georgian state since the 30 December 1922 treaty on the formation of the USSR is illegal with regard to Georgia."

After this Supreme Soviet resolution a new spiral of political activeness began in the republic. On 13 March a conference of all Georgia's opposition forces opened.

"Views immediately divided," Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Deputy N. Mgaloblishvili, told a TASS correspondent, commenting on the course of the conference, in which he took part. "And that was entirely explicable since the conference was attended by representatives of dozens of parties, unions, and societies. Some believed that the elections should be boycotted, others that it was essential to take an active part in them and create a Supreme Soviet which would express the opinion of the majority of the Georgian people. Others said it was necessary to defer the elections for a while until all existing parties have been registered so that the new parliament should be a multiparty one. I personally believe that elections in the republic are so far unacceptable. I have always struggled for the Georgian parliament being an independent and multiparty parliament—that is how I see democracy."

At the conference it was suggested that a new coalition opposition government be elected. But this is simply unrealistic right now. The majority of those taking part in the conference agreed.

Corrupt elements have also markedly galvanized their activity on the wave of democratization.

At the end of 3 days of discussion the conference elaborated a resolution announcing a boycott of the elections to the Georgian Supreme Soviet. A decision was also taken on the withdrawal of Soviet Armed Forces units from the republic's territory and on an end to the drafting of young Georgians into Soviet Army subunits and units. A demand was also made to the Georgian Communist Youth League—that it announce its self dissolution.

The conference elected a national forum which has become the coordinating organ of the Georgian national movement.

It should be noted that the following question was also debated: How to withdraw from the USSR?

Some people suggested deeming all Soviet structures illegal, extending the further destabilization of the situation, and creating their own government. Others suggested seeking Georgia's independence by parliamentary means.

As defense for their positions, the former also cite the following argument: "Our government will not be linked with the USSR by any treaties and the Union will therefore be unable to demand any compensation from the republic."

Late on the evening of 20 March one more extraordinary session of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet was held. It decided to switch the elections to October-November (until all existing parties have been registered), extending the powers of the present deputies correspondingly. The session also adopted a law on changing Articles 6,7, and 49 of the Constitution. What happened then? The opposition was not content with this. Today the national forum is already asserting that the parliament now in operation is also illegal.

A tense situation is taking shape in the republic. Acts of vandalism against monuments to V.I. Lenin are continuing. According to the official reports of the Georgian MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], this has been noted in Samtredia, Kutaisi, Gori, Zugdidi, Poti, Batumi, and Kobuleti.

Here is an example taken from the MVD summaries: "On 19 March this year at 1700 hours 200 representatives of informal associations arrived in Chokhatauri settlement from Ozurgeti with the intention of removing the monument to V.I. Lenin on Peace Street. Twelve rayon internal affairs department employees were brought in to halt criminal actions. Despite the militia's resistance, with the aid of a crane truck the mob removed the monument from its pedestal...."

On 25 March in the republic's capital the informal associations again attempted to remove a monument to V.I. Lenin on Tbilisi's Central Square.

The press center of the republic Communist Party Central Committee has distributed a report on the meeting between the republic's leaders and the leadership of the KGB, the Prosecutor's Office, the MVD, and the Ministry of Justice. It says that a definite power vacuum has formed.

The republic's Communist Party has also found itself in a complex situation today. It must be recognized, the

participants in the 22 March Georgian Communist Party Central Committee plenum said, that the party is lagging behind political events.

In this complex situation the televised appeal to the republic's people by G. Gumbaridze, chairman of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, had a timely ring.

Urging the republic's inhabitants to conciliation and consensus, G. Gumbaridze stressed that this complex stage which the republic is living through requires a high degree of responsibility from every person. Claims to a monopoly on truth, patriotism, political position, and public opinion are inadmissible here.

Central Asia

Kazakh Komsomol Congress Debates Status

PM0404102090 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 Apr 90 p 1

[Special correspondents A. Lapin and V. Simonov report: "Making Haste Slowly: Notes From the 17th Kazakh Komsomol Congress"]

[Text] Alma-Ata—At the very least, little by little we are learning to live in conditions of democracy and glasnost. We are never at a loss for words, we criticize, and sometimes we are even ready to hear the other person out. But apart from anything else, it is time we were able to work in the new conditions. And this, as the course of the extraordinary 17th Congress of the Kazakh Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] showed, is far more difficult.

Of course, one may lament the huge number of urgent questions and problems which the delegates brought with them to the congress. But all the same... discussion of the Central Committee report began—and the conversation began to be reminiscent of a shooting range when the target is lost in the fog.

The speakers talked about a lot of things—of how it is necessary to understand history, ecology, economics. They recalled Komsomol heroes, they spoke about the percentage of nonelectrified winter quarters for sheep, they routinely criticized the central organs and the press. But this was not the most important thing. Very important questions were put forward at the congress, chief among them: Should the Kazakh Komsomol have its own statutes and program, or not? And what kind of statutes? What kind of program? In other words, should the All-Union Lenin Komsomol take a step towards a federal structure, or stick to its former positions? By the middle of the second day, it was clear that the congress would not keep within its allotted time limit. And it was then decided to extend the congress.

In the end, the outcome was that a compromise solution was found on the main question. The congress adopted the program guidelines of the Kazakh Komsomol and voted in principle that the republic's organization should have its own statutes. But it postponed the adoption of these statutes until the return of Kazakhstan's delegates from the 21st All-Union Lenin Komsomol Congress, and to this end it extended the term of its own powers.

An the congress discussion centers (there were four), other fundamental questions concerning the existence of the league and its relations with other organizations were also discussed. A special discussion developed concerning the platform of the republic's Komsomol organization for the 21st All-Union Komsomol Congress. Various proposals were heard. Thus Andrey Bashkov, first secretary of Kustanay Komsomol Obkom [oblast committee], on behalf of his delegation, proposed not to adopt new statutes at the 21st All-Union Lenin Komsomol Congress at all, until such time as all the republican organs have registered as autonomous leagues. In the end, the resolution on the platform was nonetheless adopted in an article-by-article vote. It will be defended by the Kazakh Komsomol at the All-Union Congress.

Meanwhile, outside the glass walls of the Lenin Palace where the congress took place, about 30 members of informal groups gathered noisily on the steps. In spite of their small number, their slogans and demands sounded radical: "We demand that the Komsomol be disbanded!", "End immigration to Kazakhstan!", and so forth. Congress delegates invited them to join them in their discussion center. Having made a lot of noise for about 15 minutes, the informals declared their intention to form a Democratic Youth Union, and left the hall.

...During the congress itself, someone circulated a samizdat newspaper under the title of TURKESTAN among the delegates. According to the print details, it was printed in the Baltic region. Returning to the events in Alma-Ata in December 1986, the samizdat authors pile one lie upon another—about thousands of missing and dead, about atrocities by the army and the militia.... It is sad that this gibberish evidently persuaded some of the delegates to put provocative questions to the congress.

More about the decisions of the congress. The first secretary of the Kazakh Lenin Komsomol Central Committee was elected by direct secret ballot (for the first time in the history of the republic's Komsomol). Once again Imangali Tasmagambetov was chosen. The congress adopted a whole package of resolutions on the most diverse problems: ecology, the nuclear testing range, the events of December 1986, and relations with other organizations.

Participating in the work of the 17th Kazakh Lenin Komsomol Congress were N.A. Nazarbayev, chairman of the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet and first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee; U.K. Karamanov, Kazakh

SSR Council of Ministers chairman; and N. Kurzanova, secretary of the All-Union Lenin Komsomol Central Committee.

Kazakh CP Chief Nazarbayev Interviewed

PM0703102990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Feb 90 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with N. Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, in Alma-Ata by G. Dildyayev; date of interview not given: "On Party Comradeship"]

[Text] [Dildyayev] Nursultan Abishevich, I have brought letters from former communists to this meeting with you. Reading them is a bitter but, in my view, a very instructive exercise. Dictated by the desire to come clean or to throw in the towel [khlopnut dveryu], written in the genre of a confession, sermon, or reproof, they force you to think about a lot, sometimes to look at a lot in a completely new way.

[Nazarbayev] I have no regrets about those who throw in the towel, giving up their party cards, and then begin shouting about the party's split or collapse. More precisely, I regret that such renegades were not expelled from the CPSU ranks before their demonstrative "exit."

Those who have lost faith or lost heart, or who have failed to receive support are another matter. After all, when we join the party, we promise to be comrades in the struggle. The party was intended by Lenin as a union of people with the greatest closeness in spirit and the highest level of mutual understanding. Remember how benevolent and attentive Vladimir Ilich was to his comrades. Demanding, really exacting, and not tolerant of vague positions either. His human qualities also pervaded party morality. Alas, we have rather lost this from our legacy.

[Dildyayev] "I paid my dues for 20 years, went to meetings, and worked as hard as possible in those party organizations where I was registered," Grishin from Dzhambul Oblast writes. "I am not going to wipe out everything that has happened, or to talk about the futility of my own efforts. I did something, I was not the worst communist. But a sense of our disunity always depressed me and forced me to leave the party. It would seem that such a lot unites us, we have to really fight for each other, but... when I got into a mess, so to speak, I felt that party comradeship was severely lacking. I was not needed by anyone. 'The detachment did not notice the loss of a soldier....'"

How's that for a letter. You can probably say that Grishin was unlucky. And leave it at that. But you will agree, Nursultan Abishevich, that such losses are not isolated and not accidental. Why do our relations toward each other often seem to be deliberately rigid and bureaucratic? Is the general drop in standards to blame? Or is it because the apparatus and the communists live according to different criteria?

[Nazarbayev] Party comradeship is becoming more topical with each passing day. I think that the core of democratizing internal party life is to strengthen precisely feelings of party comradeship. All the pressing changes in the party, its organizational structure, and the rules must serve the purpose of restoring this feeling, filling it with a real consolidating force. Without it we will be unable to manage the tasks of perestroyka.

[Dildyayev] The CPSU Central Committee February plenum also testifies to this. Incidentally, I don't want to say that it is finished. All that happened there is only the beginning.... You did not address the plenum, but I know you prepared for it. Why? Wasn't the "homework" ready?

[Nazarbayev] I did not speak, although I partially realized this wish in the drafting committee's work on the draft CPSU Central Committee platform. I was glad that a lot of what I had already thought out coincided with the plenum's mood and conclusions. It forced people to think and to make up their minds.... Those who went to the rostrum with their "homework" often demonstrated political deafness.

By acknowledging the reality—that is, the existence not only of various views in our party environment but also of institutionalized movements and new political forces—we have been forced to defend our program and our values within the framework of the democratic process. Our starting point, new starting point is not to decree our leading role as decreed but, in staking a claim to it, to prove by our actions the validity of our claim. And now, as the processes of differentiation and definition of viewpoints proceed, we must realize that what unites us is not the requirements of the party statutes but a reborn feeling of party comradeship. The CPSU Central Committee platform for the 28th Congress, whose draft is now being studied by all society provides this hope, in my view.

"The CPSU has been stripped of its monopoly on power"—everyone put his own interpretation on this phrase which has been constantly repeated recently: Some gloat, some panic, some express regret, some are triumphant. And I, believe me, also experienced a sense of relief. Possibly this will irritate some people or else offend them, but this is how it is: precisely relief. And not only because monopoly is a heavy burden which is increased a hundred times by a growing awareness of its hopelessness and pointlessness. Liberated from it, we communists are gaining more than we are losing. We are getting the opportunity to defeat our opponents in the political struggle. We have partially forgotten the taste of real victories. Instead of them we have the bitterness of ideological and economic "overreporting" and the atrophying of fighting qualities.

[Dildyayev] Stalin built a "victorious" party on army lines—privates, generals, strict statutes requiring unthinking execution. He called it "a union of sword

bearers" united by harsh discipline. The essentially army spirit is only now being removed from the party.

[Nazarbayev] I shall not tire of repeating that in restructuring our ranks we need to make relations less formalistic. And indeed, why do we party members always live "buttoned up" with a frown on our face?

[Dildyayev] So tightly buttoned up that you can't even see the individual inside!

[Nazarbayev] This is what I am sure of now: By relying for many years on statutory discipline and rigorously regulated like-mindedness gradually we have destroyed our sense of community and each person's involvement in a real, great cause. Every person! With all his own peculiarities, social temperament, viewpoint, and reasoning... Party morality has been transformed into a collection of schematic commandments which also sustain indifference and alienation. This is the root of all our losses.

But since you began with a specific example, let me tell you about a specific case. Let us look back a little. The names of the writer Saken Seyfullin and Academicians Kanysh Satpayev and Yevney Buketov are well known to the people of Kazakhstan. These people—our national pride—were ill-treated for many years by the republic's former leadership. Today with love and a sense of eternal guilt we are returning to the people the names of repressed, slandered communists. I think that this is real party comradeship. Yes, it is late, it should have been done earlier, but, as they say, better late than never.

Incidentally, you don't have to look far for examples. A few years ago R. Cherdabayeva was released from his post as first secretary of the Guryevo party gorkom [city party committee] for, let's say, farfetched reasons. Whatever they were, he dropped out of the "nomenklatura" and worked as a petroleum engineer. When in the summer of last year the leadership of the Novouzensk party gorkom had to be renewed after the well known events, the communists remembered him. To become a first secretary for the second time is unusual even in our times. Apart from everything else, I also see in it communists' increasing solidarity.

[Dildyayev] The times in which we live are frequently and rightly called crucial. But ruining people's lives using the character of the times as justification!... Some guardians of party order are also reviving the "direct benefit" principle, the morality by which "you can't make omelets without breaking eggs...."

[Nazarbayev] There is also this.... Necessary harshness developing into intolerable cruelty.... We cannot possibly allow this to happen again.

Recently, for example, we completed a party investigation of the situation, or more correctly, the incident, the clash in Merkenskiy Rayon, Dzhambul Oblast. Let me remind you about what happened there. The obkom [oblast party committee] bureau released the first secretary of the party raykom [rayon party committee] from his post for serious shortcomings. The decision was fair. But it was not considered necessary to publicly explain and substantiate its viewpoint. At the raykom plenum most of its members did not support this decision. What was going on here! Instead of a comradely conversation and attempts to understand the communists, they were accused of cliquishness, and punitive measures rained down on them. Twenty-eight people were severely punished, and eight were expelled from the party. In short, a campaign was carried out under the slogan "We will show them!" And this is in the age of perestroyka!

[Dildyayev] In your recent public statements assessing the situation in the party you discuss the need to revive self-respect, and you appeal to people to stop belittling themselves....

[Nazarbayev] Yes, I believe that the chain of criticizing absolutely everything should be broken, a chain which has turned into a wild goose chase. Believe me, I am not a "political Tolstoyan," I am not somebody who pardons everything, but I do not share the thoughtless kind of reveling in continuously negative assessments of those who worked before us and who are now trying to do their job. To be more precise, I cannot exult over these assessments. Universal nihilism, and a thirst to raze "to the ground"—this has become an aim in itself for certain formal and informal leaders. But we have already gone through this. Yes, three times yes: Cleansing, renewal is a powerful consolidating force. But can permanent animosity and endless exploitation of dissatisfaction caused by old and new mistakes really unite people, including us communists?

I want to be correctly understood. For instance, I dared to openly criticize D. Kunayev, member of the Politburo, at our party congress. I shall say honestly that I did this after agonizing over it, according to my convictions, remembering who he was and believing that, all the same, time would provide the most correct assessments of him. And my criticism of him was constructive and to the point. But, truly, the hasty hounding of those who have retired by those who are in an opportunist rush to earn points in the new situation is always jarring. This is all part of the question of morality again.

[Dildyayev] It seems that history is repeating itself: G. Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, who worked in the republic for two and a half years, has left his post, and again occasionally I hear unfounded criticism of him by some people....

[Nazarbayev] Of course, I am not doing this to be comradely. I call such people to order. I know that even Gennadiy Vasilyevich is not content with everything that was done under him, and in my view, he worked hard and honestly.

[Dildyayev] What do you see as the next steps in the democratization of the party? Proposals to revise the CPSU Statutes and Program?

[Nazarbayev] In my view, paternalism, which left only the centralism in democratic centralism, is obstructing perestroyka in the party. More specifically? Institutionalized patronage, for instance, with its, I would say, supervisory functions. Tell me if you please, why do we still have to first take around Moscow corridors a candidate for the most insignificant post in some rayon in the republic? What's so special about that place, are his virtues more visible there?

Yes, this is formalism, but it also smacks of arrogant disregard for our own opinion and of things that bear little resemblance to real comradely relations. Overall, in my view, damage precisely to these relations is most intolerable of all is.

As I have already said, the participants in that Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee December plenum were disciplined; they dispensed with questions, and everything ended with a silent raising of hands in favor of the only candidacy put forward, which had been selected by the apparatus and nominated in the worst traditions of stagnation. And the young people of Alma-Ata asked questions.

The demonstration, which later turned into the well-known December events, was basically strictly peaceful. It was not directed against the other peoples of Kazakhstan, far less against the Russians to whom the Kazakhs are bound by age-old traditions of genuine friendship and fraternity. So, the people in the square then asked: Why didn't they make a Kazakhstani the first leader of the republic? Not only Kazakh but also Russian names were mentioned. I want to stress this particularly. Well, also the inability to listen and act in a complex situation, on the one hand, and the absence of democratic practices, on the other, passions flared up and things went from bad to worse.

Of course, unruliness cannot be forgiven. There are many more reasons for the explosion. But, I repeat, the old approach to solving cadre questions also played its part.

The CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the Work of the Kazakh Republic Party Organization on the International and Patriotic Education of the Working People" was published at the beginning of 1987. This was the first party document in many decades to attempt a critical analysis in such a complex sphere. It is understandable that the context of the time needs to be taken into account, but the haste and overloading of this resolution with old notions is so clearly visible from the vantage point of our ideas today about the national and interethnic problem. The same CPSU Central Committee platform on the nationalities question is an incomparably more profound document.

[Dildyayev] The resolution contains expressions of the type "Kazakh nationalism"....

[Nazarbayev] The public in the republic and the communists of multinational Kazakhstan appealed to the CPSU Central Committee to review these provisions which do not strengthen comradely feelings.

Some people might say that the party is finding it tough going and here is Nazarbayev picking holes in it as well. But life itself is doing that. I am sure that the difficulties will only increase if we do not give up everything that is obsolete and which hinders the party's development.

We shouldn't tie the republic communist parties to the apron strings of perpetual tutelage. Why are we still terrified by the natural question: Do the communist parties have national interests? Yes, of course they do! But who said that they necessarily conflict with party-wide and common human interests? These interests can and should be harmonized—this is the crux of the situation. Filling the Soviet Federation with new content will certainly also renew party building, and excessive centralization regulating every step both in politics and in economics should disappear. As is rightly stipulated in the platform adopted at the plenum.

[Dildyayev] But won't the growth of communist parties' independence provoke separatist sentiments? Aren't these parallel processes?

[Nazarbayev] These fears are imaginary. Real life comprises such a variety of political, economic, historical, and human ties that only a madman would decide to get rid of them. Ideological separatism can be really dangerous. I don't see any reasons for this—after all there is no alternative to the ideology of perestroyka. For all the pluralism of opinions this is the generally acknowledged starting point of all our thoughts and actions.

And lastly. We began the conversation by talking about those leaving the party and about the reasons which prompted them to do this. Let me add that in the last year about 2,500 people left our party, and 21,000 joined it! And these are reliable people because they joined the party when it is going through a difficult period.

Municipal Militia Set Up in Dushanbe

LD0404124690 Moscow TASS in English 1123 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Dushanbe April 4 TASS—By TASS correspondent Galina Gridneva:

An alternative service for the maintenance of public order—the municipal militia—has been set up in the capital of Soviet Tajikistan on the initiative of local members of parliament, the new militia is to be funded by industrial and building firms, a number of charitable organisations and donations from private individuals.

Unlike state-run law and order maintenance forces, candidacies for the municipal militia were discussed openly at meetings of work collectives and residents of every mahalli (urban residential block).

The need to establish a new type of "internal security" service was debated in the city for a long time, but its

solution was expedited by the tragic events in Dushanbe in February, city council chairman Maksud Ikramov told TASS.

On those days the majority security personnel were sent to guard party and government institutions and other downtown administrative buildings from a rampaging crowd.

The residents of blocks far from the downtown area had then to organise their own collective defence.

This was how self-defence detachments came into being and became a prototype of future municipal militia units, Ikramov emphasised.

The activists of self-defence detachments made up the core of the alternative order maintenance service, which also involves Afghan war veterans, demobilised servicemen of the Soviet Army and USSR Interior Ministry troops.

They undergo special training at the instructional and training centre of the republican interior ministry and in the state militia school under the supervision of experienced professionals.

Specialists from the law detachment of the national university read lectures to them in a course of criminalistics, ethics and other sciences.

Construction of Canal in Khorezm Oblast Viewed

LD2903194190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 29 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Summary] A series of reports by our special correspondents Nataliya Prokofyeva and Mukhtar Ganiyev have told of the ecological catastrophe in the Kara-Kalpak ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic].

Today we have a report on the situation in Khorezm Oblast.

[Correspondent] We are repeating footage from our first report on the Aral Sea area. The Kara-Kum Canal, which was designed to transform the desert into a flourishing area, took away the water of the Amu-darya and the Syr-darya. Fifty percent of its water literally disappears into the sand through its unconcreted canal bed, while 20 percent evaporates. [video shows aerial shots of dried-up Aral Sea bed and of the Kara-Kum Canal]

Now ancient Khiva is threatened with destruction. This is because yet another canal—Tashauz Canal—is being built on the boundary of Khorezm Oblast above Khiva. This canal is about 200 km long. The canal is due to carry fresh water for irrigation. The fact that the canal is now becoming green is the result of subsoil salt moisture, which is the enemy of the local fields. So as the canal's construction progresses it is this that will be carried forward towards Khorezm oasis, transform the valley into a bog, and submerge Khiva. Millions of tonnes of water will run away into the sand. [video shows pictures of Khiva mosque, aerial shots of Tashauz Canal with its sections of green salty water, and aerial shots of the Shavat-Gazavat Canal that has already existed for many years in Khorezm Oblast]